

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

JANUARY, 1928

Number 1

NEUE WIELAND-DOPPELDRUCKE

In den Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie, 1913,¹ habe ich auf die Bedeutung der Doppeldrucke für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken hingewiesen, und dabei wiederholt die Vermutung ausgesprochen, dass sich im Laufe der Zeit noch andere Drucke auffinden würden. Ein im Jahre 1918 herausgegebener Nachtrag² bestätigte bald diese Vermutung. Inzwischen habe ich wieder eine Anzahl neuer Drucke erworben, die hier beschrieben werden sollen.

ZWÖLF MORALISCHE BRIEFE IN VERSEN. 1752.

Schon äusserlich unterscheiden sich die hier in Betracht kommenden Drucke durch den Titel: *Franckfurt und Leipzig, zu finden bey Frantz Joseph Eckebrecht, 1752.* (E^a), *Franckfurt und Leipzig, verlegt Franz Joseph Eckebrecht, 1752.* (E^b). Es kommen auch Exemplare vor mit der Firma: *verlegt Johann Christoph Löffler, 1752*, die ich jedoch nicht gesehen habe. Goedeke, Grundriss IV, i, 545, 4, ist der Meinung dass alle drei Gattungen, abgesehen von den Titelblättern, denselben Druck darstellen: diese Ansicht ist jedoch falsch. *Prolegomena*³ VII, 8 gibt Seuffert eine

¹ *Die Doppeldrucke in ihrer Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken.* Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1913, Phil.-Hist. Classe, No. 7. Berlin, 1913.

² "Nachtrag zur Wieland-Bibliographie," *Modern Language Notes*, XXXIII, 282-293 (1918).

³ *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe I-VII.* Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften vom Jahre 1904, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1921. Berlin, 1904-1921. Die Mitteilungen des österr. Vereins f. Bibliothekswesen, 10, 76 ff., auf die Seuffert sich bezieht, sind mir nicht zugänglich.

Beschreibung der Drucke, mit knappem Variantenverzeichnis, welches jedoch keine zwingenden Schlüsse auf die Priorität des einen oder des anderen Druckes gestattet. Seufferts Ansicht, dass der Druck mit den zweierlei Verlagsfirmen (E^a) der ursprüngliche sein müsse, wird durch folgende Lesarten bestätigt, dagegen hat Homeyer in der Akademie-Ausgabe ⁴ den fehlervollen Doppel-
druck E^b als Grundlage benutzt:

Bl.) (2, Z. 5 unsterblicher Triebe E^a, unendlicher Triebe E^b. S. 5, 9 durch Bessern E^a durch besser E^b. 13, 18 Anmuth zum Vergnügen E^a Anmuth und Vergnügen E^b. 25, 22 grbauchte E^b Drf. 26, 20 Freygebigkeis E^a Drf. 29, 16 Geldgeiz E^a Geldgeitz E^b. 39, 10 furchtbaren Gewittern E^a fruchtbaren Gewittern E^b. 52, 10 dein Lied E^a ein Lied E^b. 78, 19 Schildeteyen E^b Drf. 79, 11 würrlich E^a wirklich E^b. 83, 3 Mädchens E^a Mädgens E^b. 94, 11 Plutarch noch Aelian E^a Plutarch und Aelian E^b. 102, 7 der Tejer singt E^a der Tejer findt E^b. 102, 20 Samischer E^a Samarischer E^b. 115, 9 wagt ichs E^a wagt ich E^b. 124, 12 Würmern E^a Würmen E^b. 125, 22 zuverlässigste E^a zuverlässige E^b. 127, 5 unedelm E^a unedlem E^b. 136, 10 beweget E^a bewegt E^b. 142, 4 in seinen Arm E^a in seinem Arm E^b. 149, 25 haben E^a hat E^b. 154, 22 mit wenigern Sonnen E^a mit weniger Sonnen E^b.

Wenn wir nun einige von diesen Stellen näher ins Auge fassen, so erhellt sofort, dass E^a den richtigen, ursprünglicheren Text bietet; z. B. S. 13, 17 f.:

So, Freundin, reitzt an dir aus edlen holden Zügen
Zur Ehrfurcht Majestät, und Anmuth zum Vergnügen.

Die verderbte Lesart von E^b: *Majestät, und Anmuth und Vergnügen* ist in die Akademie-Ausgabe (I. Brief, v, 192) hinübergenommen.

S. 39, 10:

Sie stärket unsern Muth in furchtbaren Gewittern;

Daraus macht E^b: *fruchtbaren Gewittern*; (= Akademie III, 44), also Unsinn, denn nur in furchtbaren Gewittern braucht sie, d. h.

⁴ Wielands Werke. 1 Bd. Poetische Jugendwerke, 1. Teil, Berlin, 1909.

die Weisheit, unsern Muth zu stärken, nicht in befruchtenden Regenschauern.

S. 52, 8 ff.:

Wenn sich der Herscher Ruhm in unbekannten Gräften
Mit ihrer Asche mischt, des Moders freyes Spiel,
Lebt noch ein Tullius, nützt noch dein Lied, Virgil.

Daraus macht E^b: *nützt noch ein Lied*, eine Lesart, die Homeyer (IV, 74) stillschweigend verbessert hat, ohne E^a zu kennen.

S. 94, 11 f.:

Kein Diogen, kein Liv, Plutarch noch Aelian
Zeigt mir den Glücklichen, der Weisen Phönix, an.

Dafür setzt E^b: *Plutarch und Aelian* (= Akad. VII, 197) eine unmögliche Lesart, besonders wegen des vorhergehenden 'kein.'

S. 102, 7:

Der Weise nur ist schön. Was auch der Tejer singt,
Kein Kleobulus ist dem hier der Streit gelingt,
Wenn sich Aesop ihm stellt.

Daraus macht E^b: *Was auch der Tejer findt*, was nur als Lesefehler zu erklären ist, der nun auch in der Akademie-Ausgabe wiederkehrt (VIII, 45).

S. 102, 20, Anm. 4: *Gleichfalls ein Samischer Knabe, dessen Gemälde Anakreon in der 29. Ode mit Meisterzügen entwirft*. Dafür setzt E^b: *ein Samarischer Knabe* (so noch in Akad., Anm. zu VIII, 49). Dass Anakreon, der auf Samos lebte, nicht mit Samaria in Verbindung zu bringen ist, leuchtet wohl ohne weiteres ein.

S. 125, 22, Anm. 2: *Xenophon, der uns das zuverlässigste vom Leben des Sokrates hinterlassen hat*. Dafür hat E^b den Druckfehler *zuverlässige*, der auch in die Akademie-Ausgabe (Anm. zu x, 48) übergegangen ist.

S. 142, 4:

Hier eilt in seinen Arm der weisen Freunde Heer,

anstatt dessen E^b: *in seinem Arm liest* (so auch Akad. x, 290). Dass der Dativ hier unmöglich ist, wird wohl ohne weiteres zugegeben werden.

S. 154, 22, Anm.: *nach den Ideen derjenigen Sternkündiger*

beschrieben, welche sie (d. h., die Milchstrasse) vor eine unendliche Menge mit wenigern Sonnen vermischter Planeten halten; anstatt *wenigern* hat E^b den Druckfehler *weniger*, den Homeyer (Anm. zu XI, 152) in *wenigen* verbessert.

Dass also E^a durchweg die bessere, ursprüngliche Lesart habe, wird wohl kaum zu bezweifeln sein. Folglich ist auch dies der frühere Druck: Seuffert meint zwar (*Prolegomena*, VII, 8), "der spätere Neudruck kann einen verständigeren und dazu achtsameren Setzer oder Korrektor gefunden haben, als es der Verfasser war, falls er überhaupt beim Druck mitwirkte," aber dies lässt sich nur für den Einzelfall annehmen, nie für einen ganzen Band. Und in diesem Falle hätte der damalige Korrektor noch achtsamer sein müssen als ein jetziger Herausgeber einer kritischen Ausgabe, der, durch den unechten Doppeldruck irre geführt, nur an einer einzigen von den hier besprochenen Stellen die ursprüngliche Lesart herstellen konnte.

MUSARION, LEIPZIG, 1769.

Zu den fünf früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{2abcde} treten zwei neue, E^{2fg}. Keiner von den bis jetzt bekannten späteren Drucken scheint nachgewirkt zu haben, die Ausgabe letzter Hand geht anscheinend auf den Originaldruck E^{2a} zurück. Lesarten: S. II, 12 wenn ich . . . setze E^{2a} wenn er . . . setze E^{2bcdefg}. VI, 12 Scheu E^{2abcdeg} Schen E^{2f} Drf. IX, 3, 4 gezüchtigt E^{2abcd} gezüchtigt E^{2efg}. X, 6 blendt E^{2abcg} blendet E^{2ef}. 5, 19 Empfindungslos E^{2abcdeg} Empfindungslos E^{2ef}. 7, 17 Übermaaß E^{2g} Drf. 14, 20 entdeckte E^{2f} Drf. 25, 3 verzeihenswerh E^{2f} Drf. 35, 7 und 71, 2 doch E^{2abcd} noch E^{2efg}. 54, 1 Augenwinkel E^{2aefg} Augewinkel E^{2bcd}. 63, 14 allgemach E^{2abcdef} allegemach E^{2g}. 71, 10 ljbliches E^{2g} Drf. 72, 5 Espladian E^{2abcd} Espladian E^{2efg}. 105, 15 fast E^{2abcdeg} faßt E^{2ef}. 116, 13 kein Aug' gehört, kein Ohr gesehen E^{2abd} kein Ohr gehört, kein Aug' gesehen E^{2cefg}. 116, 15 handgriflich E^{2g} Drf. 124, 7 Garten, den E^{2a} Garten, der E^{2bcdefg}. 125, 11 andres E^{2abcd} anders E^{2efg}.

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΜΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Zu den vier früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{abcd} kommen noch zwei neue, E^{ef}. Der Druck E^e steht eigentlich dem Originaldruck E^a am nächsten, so dass die richtige Reihenfolge E^{aebcd} wäre. In

E^e laufen die beiden Hälften der Kopfleiste symmetrisch nach rechts und links, nur S. 228, 266, 296 sind sie nach rechts, und S. 149 verkehrt, nach innen, gerichtet. Falsche Seitenzahlen finden sich: 81 anstatt 18; 234 anstatt 237; 205 anstatt 250. Der andere neue Druck, E^f, der jüngste von allen bis jetzt bekannten, lässt sich leicht erkennen, indem hier nur die halbe Kopfleiste vorkommt, die ausnahmslos nach rechts gerichtet ist.

Als Vorlage für die Ausgabe letzter Hand hat E^c, oder ein ähnlicher, noch unbekannter Druck gedient, dessen Änderungen durchweg rückgängig zu machen sind. Lesarten: S. 15, 10 maschinenmäßige E^{ae} maschinenmäßige E^{bcd^f}. 25, 1 Character E^{abce} Charakter E^{df}. 40, 17.18 hüten? E^a hüten; E^{bcd^{ef}}. 48, 20 bloß E^{ab^{cd}de} bloß E^f. 54, 12 sauge E^{ae} fange E^{bcd^f}. 79, 8 auszuschmücken E^{abce^f} auszuschmützen E^f. 114, 3 zu thun E^e Drf. 114, 5.15 Corinthier E^{abce} Corinther E^{df}. 128, 20 spat gehohlt hätte E^{ae} spät gehohlt hätte E^{bcd} spät gehohlt hatte E^f. 203, 2 schiefen Begriffen E^{abe} falschen Begriffen E^{cd^fC}. 248, 14 oder zwar gebohren aber nicht erwachsen E^{abe}: *der Satz fehlt* E^{cd^fC} weil der Setzer E^c auf *oder zwar* der folgenden Zeile abirrte. 254, 15 zu thun genug hätte E^{ae} zu thun gehabt hätte E^{bcd^f}.

BEYTRÄGE ZUR GEHEIMEN GESCHICHTE DES MENSCHLICHEN
VERSTANDES UND HERZENS, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Der neue, mit E^e zu bezeichnende Druck sollte eigentlich zwischen E^{ab} und E^{cd} eingereiht werden. Seine Lesarten gehen auf E^c über und von hier auf die Ausgabe letzter Hand. Äusserlich ist er E^c ähnlich, indem die Kopfleiste (siehe *Doppeldrucke*, S. 12) durchweg übereinstimmt: nur auf S. 72 des zweiten Theiles hat E^e die Leiste nach links, E^c nach rechts. Lesarten:

I. Theil: S. 7, 7 zu Bürgermeister E^{ab} zum Bürgermeister E^{cde}. 9, 2 euch E^{abce} auch E^d. 19, 18 dnrch E^e Drf. 25, 19 Getümmel E^a Drf. 36, 15. 16 aufestülpte E^e Drf. 43, 8 Gründe E^{abce} Grundsätze E^d. 45, 18 erfodert E^{ab} erfordert E^{cde}. 47, 16 ber Wärme E^a Drf. 68, 9 auffallende E^{ab} ausfallende E^{cde}. 68, 13 bedenken E^{ab} denken E^{cde}. 69, 10 sich E^{abce} sie E^d. 72, 16 Alphabets E^{a^{cd}} Alphabeths E^{be}. 81, 10 Masüthim E^a Masülhim E^{bcd^e}. 82, 5 Augensprache E^a Aussprache E^{bcd^e}. 84, 12 ferdig ssnd E^d Drf. 87, 6 heterogenen E^a betrogenen E^{bcd^e}. 87, 16 ausarbeitet E^{ab} ausbreitet E^{cde}. 92, 10 wie er E^{ad} wie es E^{bce}. 93, 1 geometrisch-

E^{abcd} geometrich- E^e. 178, 7 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}. 212, 16 werden E^{abcd} werten E^e *Drf.*

II. Theil: S. 34, 12 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}. 36, 13 der Menschheit E^{abce} von Menschheit E^d. 67, 9 solchem Maße E^a solcher Maße E^{bcd}. 99, 18 gedaurt E^{abe} gedauert E^d. 109, 16 Wissenstrieb E^{abd} Wissenstrieb E^{ce}. 124, 16 ddr Basiliade E^e *Drf.* 130, 6 Gelübde E^{ad} Geliebte E^{bce} *Drf.* 138, 15 Antoninus E^{abd} Antonius E^{ce}. 164, 18 ordentlichen E^{abcd} ordentlicher E^e. 176, 3. 9 Pariß E^{abe} Paris E^{cd}. 177, 16 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}: an 9 weiteren Stellen dieselbe Lesart. 178, 9 unteschieden E^e *Drf.* 182, 4 Rubinen E^e *Drf.* 186, 15 ebn so E^e *Drf.* 188, 16 dem Staat E^{abcd} den Staat E^e. 196, 2 Sterb-| lichen E^{abcd} Sterb-| chen E^e *Drf.* 201, 1 unmmenschliche E^e *Drf.* 214, 5 erfodert E^{ab} erfordert E^{cde}. 220, 12 arkadischen E^{acd} arkadischer E^{be}. 225, 5 emporstrebenden E^{ab} emporstehenden E^{cde}. 226, 2 Thätigkeit E^{ab} Thätlichkeit E^{cde}. 227, 20 Vervollkommung E^{abe} Vervollkommnung E^{cd}.

COMBABUS, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Die vier bisher bekannten Drucke haben alle einen geraden Doppelstrich als Kopfleiste, der neu hinzukommende Druck E^e hat dagegen die halbe, bei dem Druck E^f des Sokrates vorkommende Leiste, die hier stets nach rechts gerichtet ist. Die Drucke E^{bde} scheinen jeder direkt von E^a abzustammen, während E^c, von welchem die Ausgabe letzter Hand abstammt, E^b als Vorlage benutzte. Lesarten: S. 3, 10 ins Nichts E^{abde} in Nichts E^c. 4, 3 eine Circe E^{ade} ein Circe E^{bc}. 4, 5 Crates E^{abcd} Cartes E^e. 12, 5 aus seinen E^{ade} aus seinem E^{bc}. 12, 7 seinen Scherz E^{ade} keinen Scherz E^{bc}. 14, 12 Crone E^{abce} Krone E^d. 20, 7 dein eignes E^{abcd} dein eigen E^e. 21, 4 rief er wild E^{abcd} rief er mild E^e. 22, 17 Combabus thun, um E^{ad} Combabus thun, und E^{bc} Combabus thun, um E^e. 24, 17 minders E^{abd} minder E^{ce}; anf E^a *Drf.* 25, 2 Liebesgottt E^b *Drf.* 27, 18 Combab E^{abc} Combab E^d Cambab E^e. 31, 19 liebt E^{abcd} lieöt E^e *Drf.* 38, 10 die-| sen E^{ae} diesen| E^{bcd}. 39, 3 gescha-| det E^{ae} geschadet| E^{bcd}. 46, 2 ohne E^{abcd} yhne E^e *Drf.* 46, 17 Astarte E^{acde} Astarde E^b. 51, 20 Kniee E^{abde} Knie E^e. 52, 1. 2 vorange-| schickt. E^{abe} vorange-| schickt, E^c voran-| geschickt. E^d. 58, 17 Combabens E^{abde} Combabus E^e. 62, 6 bittet ihm . . . ab E^{abcd} bittet ihn . . . ab E^e.

62, 7 vom Anschein E^{ade} von Anschein E^{bc}. 63, 2. 3 ein Op-| fer E^{abc} ein| Opfer E^c ein Opfer| E^d.

POETISCHE SCHRIFTEN DES HERRN WIELANDS. DRITTE VERB.

AUFL., ZÜRICH, 1770. DRITTER BAND.

Doppeldrucke S. 13 gab ich eine Auswahl aus den Lesarten des ersten und zweiten Bandes der Drucke B² und B³, woraus man folgern durfte, dass B³ ein einfacher Doppeldruck sei, der ohne Mitwirken des Dichters veranstaltet worden war. Dasselbe lässt sich von dem inzwischen erworbenen dritten Bande sagen: auch hier ist B³ eine Fehlerquelle für die Ausgabe letzter Hand, die von diesem Drucke abstammt. Lesarten: S. 15, 30 diß B² dieß B³. 17, 9 einmals B^{1.2} einsmals B³ C¹. 20, 29 verklärt' B² verklärt B³: *ähnlich* 21, 21 liebt'; 21, 27 eilt'; 29, 10 bebt'; 30, 5 sagt'. 22, 9 auf jeglichem B^{1.2} an jeglichem B³ C¹. 23, 10 befallen; B^{1.2} befallen? B³ C¹. 30, 4 Stärke sie dann, erbarmender Schöpfer, damit sie nicht sterbe! B^{1.2}: *der ganze Vers* (I, 447) *fehlt* B³ C¹. In C¹ wurde dann der Anfang des folgenden Verses geändert, um den Sinn herzustellen. 38, 16 Isca B^{1.2} Isac B³ Drf. 44, 29 zur Erde B^{1.2} zu Erde B³. 46, 6 Herzen B^{1.2} Herze B³ Herz C¹. 106, 17 sechszechnen B² sechszechnen B³. 108, 1 Nennt B^{1.2} Nenn B³. 108, 31 gebohren wardst B^{1.2} gebohren warst B³. 113, 20 rinsumgeben B² Drf. ringsumgeben B³. 128, 9 Geheimmniß B² Drf. 136, 23 unglükl'ge B^{1.2} unglüksel'ge B³. 138, 14 gesandt, sich B² gesandt, die B³ Drf. 142, 9 würden B² würde B³ Drf. 192, 17 erfodert B² erfordert B³. 207, 5 Erbgut B² Erdgut B³ Drf. 209, 33 Schauerte B^{1.2} Schauderte B³ C¹. 210, 26 Ueberschaut B² Uederschaut B³ Drf. 210, 33 Augen der der meisten B² Drf. Augen der meisten B³. 212, 1 Lorrbeern B² Lorbeern B³. 214, 31 des Lager B² Drf. das Lager B^{1.3}. 215, 33 kriegrischen B² C¹ kriegerischen B³.

DIE GRAZIEN, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Zu den fünf früher beschriebenen Drucken tritt jetzt ein sechster (E^f), der sich schon äusserlich von den andern unterscheidet, indem hier nur die halbe Kopfleiste gebraucht wird, die mit Ausnahme der Seiten 113, 157, 179 nach rechts gerichtet ist (Vgl. den Druck E^d der *Beyträge*, 1770). Lesarten: S. 5, 15 Ihrem E^{abcde} ihrem E^f. 6, 2 Ihnen E^{abcde} ihnen E^f. 7, 5 wollten; E^a

Interpunktion verkehrt. 11, 8 letzten E^{abcde} letztern E^f. 20, 6. 7 Schäferinnen E^d Drf. 30, 14 Hayns E^{aef} Hahns E^{bcd}. 46, 9 goldener E^{abcde} goldner E^f. 53, 8 will ich E^{abc} ich will E^{def}. 67, 6 vor E^{abcde} von E^f 84, 4 gesungen E^{abcde} gefunden E^f. 93, 12 eh sie E^a es sie E^{bcd} da sie E^{ef}. 110, 2 diese schöne E^{abc} die schöne E^{def} C¹. 138, 15 dolcezza E^{abc} dolezza E^{def}. 173, 3 Um alle E^{abc} Und alle E^{def}. 174, 5 glautbet E^a Drf. glaubtet E^{bcd} glaubt E^f. 176, 15 vermandt E^a Drf. verwandt E^{bcd}. 178, 2 steht E^a sieht E^{bcd}. 179, 3 kindlich E^{abc} kleindlich E^d kleinlich E^f. 197, 16 bezaubernden E^{abcde} bezauberten E^f. 205, 4 Im Geiste E^{abcde} In Geiste E^f.

GESCHICHTE DES FRÄULEINS VON STERNHEIM, LEIPZIG, 1771.

In seinem Neudruck des von Wieland herausgegebenen Romans der La Roche (DLD. 138) stellt Ridderhoff drei Drucke des Jahres 1771 fest: dabei wird der korrekteste derselben (C) als jüngster angesehen, und zur Grundlage des Textes gemacht. Die wenigen von Ridderhoff mitgeteilten Lesarten gestatten keine sichere Identifizierung mit den drei mir vorliegenden Exemplaren: wenn z. B. Ridderhoffs Angabe (S. xxxviii) richtig ist, dass die anderen Ausgaben (also seine Drucke ABC) *Denkungsart* lesen, so sind ihm meine Drucke E^{bc} unbekannt geblieben, während mir nur Einer von seinen drei Drucken ABC vorliegt.

Schon die Kopfleisten gestatten eine schnelle und sichere Unterscheidung der verschiedenen Drucke: im allgemeinen laufen die beiden Hälften symmetrisch nach rechts und links. Ausnahmen: in E^a laufen auf S. 100, 136, 166, 206, 218, 254, 272, 302, 328 des ersten Bandes beide Hälften nach links, und auf S. 111, 113, 145, 191, 195, 239, 269, 291, 335 sind beide verkehrt, nach innen gerichtet; in E^b sind die beiden Hälften nur auf S. 105, 141 verkehrt, nach innen gerichtet; in E^c geht die Leiste ohne Ausnahme symmetrisch nach rechts und links.

Lesarten. Da für unsere Zwecke hauptsächlich die von Wieland geschriebene Vorrede in Betracht kommt, so sind folgende Lesarten sämtlich dem ersten Bande entnommen: S. iv, 17 Character E^a Charakter E^{bc}. v, 8 fühle, E^a Drf. fühle. E^{bc}. v, 9 für Sie E^{ab} für sie E^c. v, 15 tugendhafeen E^a Drf. v, 19 Freundin! E^a Freundin; E^{bc}. vi, 1 wirklich E^a wirklich E^{bc}. vi, 6 Geschenke E^{ac} Geschenke E^b. vi, 14 Nntzen E^a Drf. vi, 20 überflüssig E^a über-

flüßig E^{bc}. vi, 22 Andre E^a Andere E^{bc}. viii, 18 Denkensart E^a Denkungsart E^{bc}. x, 7 sind! E^a sind; E^{bc}. xiii, 8 Ihnen E^a ihnen E^{bc}. xiv, 21 Bewustseyn E^a Bewußtseyn E^{bc}. xv, 9 Männer E^a Männern E^{bc} Drf. xvi, 13 angelegten E^a ausgelegten E^{bc}. xviii, 5 ihre E^{ab} ihrer E^c. xix, 6 Schönheiten E^b Drf. xxi, 13 soviel E^a so viel E^{bc}. xxi, 16 denen es gar E^a denen gar E^{bc}. xxii, 9 weche E^b Drf. 2, 12 verband ihn E^a verband ihm E^{bc} Drf. 5, 1 Lady E^{ab} Layd E^c Drf. 6, 4 genaueste E^{ab} genauste E^c. 6, 6. 7 Besor-|gniß E^{ab} Besorg-|niß E^c. 7, 24 die Frage E^a diese Frage E^{bc}. 12, 2 ihre E^a Ihre E^{bc}. 12, 13 Ihr E^a ihr E^{bc}. 16, 22 Nahmens E^a Namens E^{bc}. 24, 7 zärtlichen E^a zärtlichsten E^{bc}. 25, 23 Unmöglich! E^a Unmöglich, E^{bc}. 27, 23 entsagen! E^a entsagen? E^{bc}. 32, 9 mißhandelt E^a gemißhandelt E^{bc}. 32, 12 mißbraucht E^a gemißbraucht E^{bc}. 33, 3 leichte E^{ab} leicht E^c. 34, 9 allen E^a allein E^{bc} Drf. 35, 16 schuldig! E^a schuldig? E^{bc}. 37, 9 weis E^a weiß E^{bc}. 41, 4 Gemahlin: E^a Gemahlin! E^{bc}. 41, 12; 48, 14 gewiedmet E^a gewidmet E^{bc}. 43, 6 weil ich E^{ab} weil es E^c Drf. 45, 2 Zeitpunct E^a Zeitpunkt E^{bc}. 45, 21 Militar-Diensten E^{ab} Militär-Diensten E^c. 46, 9 itzige E^a itzigen E^{bc}. 46, 13 leicht sind E^a leicht ist E^{bc}. 46, 24 herausgezogen worden bin E^a herausgezogen bin E^{bc}. 49, 13 ihrem Nächsten E^a ihren Nächsten E^{bc}. 53, 19 Fußstapfen E^a Fußstapfen E^{bc} (vgl. 78, 6). 57, 12 Weibspersonen E^a Weibespersonen E^{bc}. 60, 19 vom wahren E^a von wahren E^{bc}. 61, 8 von P., aus, kommen E^a von P. aus kommen, E^{bc}. 62, 3 von Regierung E^a von der Regierung E^{bc}. 69, 3 allem was E^a allem, was E^b allem, was E^c: das m verkehrt. 69, 17 hatte E^a hat E^{bc}. 75, 22 Schmerzens E^{ab} Schmerzens, E^c. 78, 6 Fußstapfen E^a Fußstapfen E^{bc} (vgl. 53, 19). 78, 14 Thräneu E^c Drf. 80, 7 Grosmutter E^a Großmutter E^{bc}.

ALCESTE, LEIPZIG, 1773.

Schon äusserlich unterscheidet sich der neu hinzukommende Druck E^d von den früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{abc}, dadurch dass in jenem die (halbe) Kopfleiste ausnahmslos nach rechts gerichtet ist: in E^{ab} ist die Leiste nach links (in E^b mit Ausnahme der Seiten 13, 43, 71), in E^c dagegen regellos nach rechts oder links gerichtet. Der Druck E^d stammt von E^c oder einem ähnlichen Drucke ab, und ist der jüngste von allen bis jetzt bekannten. Nachwirkung auf die Ausgabe letzter Hand ist nicht festzustellen. Lesarten: S. 7, 7 erschließe E^a Drf. 11, 18 O mein

E^{abc} O! mein E^d. 17, 6 gebohren E^{abc} geboren E^d. 19, 4 Stirbt — E^{abc} Stirb — E^d. weißt E^{ab} weißt E^{cd}. 27, 9 zu sehn E^{abc} zu seyn E^d. 27, 13 schrecklichsten E^{ab} schrecklichen E^{cd}. 27, 14 Nicht E^{abc} Nichts E^d. 36, 6 In deinen E^{abc} In deinem E^d. 48, 1 Admet; E^{ab} Admet! E^{cd}. 49, 14 Kleinmüthiger E^{ab} Kleinmüthig E^{cd}. 54, 11 stößt E^a flößt E^{bcd}. 56, 4 Schale E^{abc} Schaale E^d. 62, 8 Admet E^a Alceste E^{bcd}. 65, 5 Umgangs E^{abd} Umgans E^c. 76, 15 Princessin E^{abc} Princessinn E^d. 77, 1 haben; E^{ab} haben? E^{cd}. 77, 9 entschlüpfen! E^a entschlüpfen? E^{bcd}. 81, 11 ihn ewig, ewig dauren E^{ab} ihn ewig, dauren E^c ihn ewig dauren E^d.

PEREGRINUS PROTEUS, LEIPZIG, 1791.

In den "Nachträgen" (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxiii, 291 ff.) habe ich auf das Vorhandensein einer geringeren Ausgabe hingewiesen: hier handelt es sich um einen seitengleichen Doppeldruck (E^b)^s der guten Ausgabe, der äusserlich genau mit dem Originaldruck E^a übereinstimmt—nur ist das Papier in E^b etwas dünner. Der Originaldruck E^a kennzeichnet sich als solchen durch genauere Übereinstimmung mit dem *Merkur* (J); vereinzelt kehren die Lesarten des jüngeren Druckes E^b in C¹ wieder, ohne dass direkte Abstammung als sicher anzunehmen wäre. Die geringere Ausgabe E^c stammt direkt von E^a ab. Lesarten:

ERSTER THEIL. S. 31, 15 schiffte E^a schifftr E^b *Drf.* 74, 9 dald E^a *Drf.* bald E^b. 88, 1 vorwaltete E^a verwaltete E^b. 91, 18 ehemals E^a ehemals E^b. 96, 11 ihrer E^a ihrer E^b *Drf.* 113, 2 einigen Argwohn JE^aC¹ einen Argwohn E^b. 115, 7 andre E^a andere E^b. 128, 12 genöthigt E^a genöthiget E^b. 158, 13 Sott der Gonne E^a *Drf.* Gott der Sonne E^b. 185, 14 erfodert E^a erfordert E^b. 192, 7. 8 etlicheu E^a *Drf.* 193, 1 Schale E^a Schaale E^b. 193, 19 Terrasse E^a Terasse E^b. 201, 10 Golddraht E^a Golddrath E^b. 204, 15 ehmaliger E^a ehemaliger E^b. 209, 4 zerfließen E^a *Drf.* zerfließen E^b. 237, 14 meiner E^b *Drf.* 242, 18 vollkommnerer E^aC¹ vollkommner E^b. 251, 6 die sie E^a die sich E^b *Drf.* 251, 19 villeicht E^a *Drf.* 272, 1 schönen E^aC¹ schönsten E^b. 290, 1 bedauern E^a bedauren E^b. 294, 10 Gunstbezeugungen E^aC¹ Gunstbezeugungen E^b. 311, 16 Denkensart JE^a Denkungsart E^bC¹.

^s Nachtrag S. 291 wurde diese Sigle der geringeren Ausgabe zugewiesen: nunmehr wird letztere mit E^c bezeichnet.

319, 16 mir ihren E^a mit ihren E^b *Drf.* 320, 15 schmähhlichen E^a schmähligien E^b. 335, 3 hätten E^a hätte E^bC¹. 340, 18 auferstandnen E^a auferstandenen E^b. 345, 4. 5 amüsieren E^a amüsiren E^b. 350, 20 bedeckt E^a dedeckt E^b *Drf.* Anstatt 315 hat E^b die Seitenzahl 31.

ZWEYTER THEIL. S. 4, 17 ehemalige E^a ehemalige E^b. 16, 11 mußte E^a muste E^b. 17, 2 wußte E^a wuste E^b. 19, 10 geschwiegen E^a geschwigen E^b. 22, 4 erwecken E^a erweken E^b. 34, 14 erkundigen? E^a erkundigen: E^b erkundigen; E^c. 41, 4. 5 eine viereckige E^a rine viereckigte E^b. 44, 10 Ansehen E^a Ansehn E^b. 49, 6 Glaubigen . . . Unglaubigen E^a Gläubigen . . . Ungläubigen E^b. 86, 11 Fälle E^a *Drf.* Füllen E^b. 94, 4 das Zeichen E^a das Zeichen E^b. 95, 16 Initiirten E^a *Drf.* Initiirten E^b. 100, 14 allmählich E^a allmählig E^b. 133, 9 disponieren E^a disponiren E^b. 168, 12 einem E^b (*das m verkehrt*). 180, 13 mußten. Es E^a mußten, Es E^b *Drf.* 235, 6 diesmal E^a dießmal E^b. 256, 17 verschaffte E^a verschafte E^b. 279, 7 glühte E^a glüthe E^b. 308, 15 werden E^a wetden E^b *Drf.* 344, 3 Arbrissell E^a Arbrissel E^b. 353, 8 verdießlicher E^a *Drf.* verdrüßlicher E^b. 357, 4 anging E^a angienig E^b. 361, 6 Reitz E^a Reiz E^b (*ähnlich* 368, 6; 371, 8). 386, 19 nicht E^a niche E^b *Drf.* 387, 5 angewandt E^a angewandi E^b *Drf.* 388, 9 bloß E^a blos E^b. 389, 20 besonnenen E^a *Drf.* 409, 17. 18 sanctioniert E^a sanctionirt E^b. Anstatt 275 hat E^a die Seitenzahl 257.

W. KURRELMAYER.

THE CASE OF THE PREDICATE COMPLEMENT AFTER REFLEXIVE VERBS IN OLD FRENCH

It has been rather generally accepted by Romance scholars that the correct usage after reflexive verbs in Old French is the nominative case for the predicate complement. When the oblique case has appeared, it has been explained either as the beginning of a breakdown in case, or as a grammatical error, apparently a remnant of the influence of Classical Latin. In a note to *Yvain*, 3020,¹ Foerster says, "—altfz. aber steht beim direkten Refl. das Präd. im Nom." The same explanation is to be found in the grammars of Diez and Meyer-Lübke.²

¹ *Yvain*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1912; Rom. Bibl. v).

In an effort to discover how frequently the oblique case is used instead of the nominative in early documents, as well as to find some reason for choice between the two forms, I have examined some twenty epics and romances as well as briefer forms. The texts studied make up in all nearly two hundred thousand lines of Old French. These poems are fairly representative of the language from its beginnings to the end of the 13th Century. A number of the texts—*Eulalie*, *Saint Léger*, *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, and *Eneas* to be exact—yielded no material.

The examples which I have found are as follows:

Alexis:³ NOMINATIVE, il se fist si estranges (122, c); OBLIQUE, no examples.

Roland:⁴ NOM., Li emperere se fait et balz et liez (96), Mult se fait fiers (897), Plus se fait fiers (1111), s'en clament tuit dolent (1608), Tant se fait forz⁵ et fiers et maneviz (2125), s'en contienent plus queit (3555), se cuntient plus queit (3797), si se claimet caitis (3817); OBL., Cil se feint mort (2275).

Couronnement de Louis:⁶ NOM., no examples; OBL., Li Sarrezins se sent navre (958), Tels se fait ore et orgoillos et fier (1512), Vers orgoillos se feseit molt très fier (1932).

Aliscans:⁷ NOM., no examples; OBL., Sovents fois se clame las dolent (720), Plus se fait fier (4581).

Mort Aymeri:⁸ NOM., se sent navrez el cors (1174), Et se clamerent chetif maleüré (1982), chetif se clament (2497); OBL., Et se clama chetif, maleüré (182), se senti abatu (1146).

Les Narbonnais:⁹ NOM., no examples; OBL., se clament chetis (7865).

³ F. Diez, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 1872, III, 120; W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, (Paris, 1900), III, 48, 49.

⁴ *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch*, ed. Foerster and Koschwitz (Leipzig, 1911).

⁵ *Das Altfranzösische Rolandslied*, ed. Stengel (Leipzig, 1900) I.

⁶ It is to be noted that the Oxford MS. reads *fort* instead of *forz*. This would make line 2125 an example of double usage.

⁷ *Le Couronnement de Louis*, ed. E. Langlois (Paris, 1888).

⁸ *Aliscans*, ed. Reinbach, Hartnacke, Rasch (Halle, 1903).

⁹ *La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne*, publié par J. Couraye du Parc (Paris, 1884).

¹⁰ *Les Narbonnais*, ed. H. Suchier (Paris, 1898).

Aiols.¹⁰ NOM., Marchegai se sant si delivres (1038), Aiols se tient tous cois (4328), Si se claime dolant, maleurés, caitis (5083), se tinrent mu et coi (7874), Teus se peut ore faire baus et joians et liés (8591); OBL., Ie me tieng chier (980), Si se claime dolant, maleurés, caitis (5083),¹¹ Li Lonbars . . . ains se fait mort (9011), De chou me renc coupable (9652).

Elie de Saint Gille.¹⁰ NOM., Mout se fait orgellous et hardis (366), Guillaume d'Orange se senti desloïés (613), Por nule rien en tere ne se fesist se liés (614); OBL., no examples.

Alexandre le Grand.¹² NOM., s'en firent lié chevalier et sergant (150); OBL., li rois s'en fist joiant (149).

Roman d'Alexandre.¹³ NOM., se vif se laissent prendre (106, l. 15); OBL., caitif ne se claint (188, l. 22), li reis se sent bleicié (401, l. 17), se fist signor clamer (489, l. 37).

Thèbes.¹⁴ NOM., Quant il se sentiront traï (3164); OBL., no examples.

Troie.¹⁵ NOM., A grant maniere se fait liez (:couchiez) (1769), Mout se claime chascuns dolenz (:denz) (3570), Ne se fist pas taisanz ne muz (:venuz) (3784), A tant se clamera chaitis (:ocis) (4903), Tant par se porreit faire liez (:desconseilliez) (6469), il s'en fait liez (:espleitiez) (22059), Mout se firent joiant e lié (:veilié) (27309); OBL., Bon conseiller se fait a lui (5781), E mout s'en fait Prianz irié (:deshaitié)—variant (634, line 12).

Philomena.¹⁶ NOM., Don Pandions mout liez se fist (8), Mout liez s'an fist? (9); OBL., no examples.

Erec.¹⁷ NOM., Tant se face orgueilleus ne cointes (:acointes) (3877); OBL., no examples.

Cligés.¹⁸ NOM., Qui chastes ne se viaut tenir (5326); OBL., se sant grevé (:esgené) (619).

¹⁰ *Aiols et Mirabel und Elie de Saint Gille*, ed. Foerster (Heilbronn, 1876-82).

¹¹ Note that in this line the verb is followed by both nominative and oblique cases in the predicate complement.

¹² *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen âge*, par Paul Meyer (Paris, 1886), I, 121.

¹³ *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, ed. H. Michelant (Stuttgart, 1846).

¹⁴ *Le Roman de Thèbes*, ed. L. Constans (Paris, 1890).

¹⁵ *Le Roman de Troie*, ed. L. Constans (Paris, 1904-12), 6 vol.

¹⁶ *Philomena*, ed. C. De Boer (Paris, 1909).

¹⁷ *Erec*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1909; *Rom. Bibl.*, XIII).

¹⁸ *Cligés*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1910; *Rom. Bibl.*, I).

Lancelot:¹⁹ NOM., Cil . . . qui dedanz anfermé se voient (2345), se tient Si coiz (4594-5); OBL., Mout s'an fet lié, mout s'an fet riche (:fiche) (1479), Si se fet las et traveillié (:beillié) (4565), Et quant cil se sant domagié (:tranchié) (7086).

Yvain:²⁰ NOM., Qu'il se santi navrez a mort (874), Mes nutz se voit (3020), Qui miauz s'ameroit morz que vis Sovant se claime las cheitis (4131-2); OBL., Ou vos vos clamez recreant (:creant) (5539), Ainz me clamasse recreant (:creant) (6281).

Perceval:²¹ NOM., chevaliers se fet (5235); OBL., se fust lors fere chevalier (4816).

Guillaume d'Angleterre:²² NOM., coi se tienent (392), Don li anfes se fist mout liez (:viez) (1642); OBL., no exemples.

La Vengeance Raguidel:²³ NOM., Qui(s) tient a faus plains de tosique (1852), Qu'il se santi navrés a mort (5603), Fiers et hardis . . . S'ofre (5718); OBL., Gaberiés se sent feru (:escu) (3317).

Ille et Galeron:²⁴ NOM., Malades se sent (5195); OBL., Celui qui prison ne se rent (1163), Qui vif se laisse illoques prendre (2712).

Amadas et Ydoine:²⁵ NOM. and OBL., Mult se claime dolans, caitif (:estrif) (881).

Richars li Biaus:²⁶ NOM., Ains se tient cois (1913); OBL., Qu'il se tiegne fort (:effort) (2597), Quant li soudans se sent navre (:pre) (2836), Quant Richars l'ot mout s'en fait lie (:baisie) (3035), Richars . . . se fait lie (3684).

Roman de Rou:²⁷ NOM., no exemples; OBL., Normanz se faiseient numer (129).

Guillaume de Palerne:²⁸ NOM. and OBL., se fier se face Si prox,

¹⁹ *Lancelot*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1889).

²⁰ *Yvain*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1912; *Rom. Bibl.* v).

²¹ *Perceval* [*Chrestien's von Troyes Contes del Graal* (*Percevaus li galois*)] ed. G. Baist, Freiburg i. Br. [1912]. Date in *Rom. Bibl.* XXI, 225.

²² *Wilhelm von England*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1911; *Rom. Bibl.*, xx).

²³ *La Vengeance Raguidel*, ed. M. Friedwagner (Halle, 1909).

²⁴ *Ille und Galeron*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1891, *Rom. Bibl.*, vii).

²⁵ *Amadas et Ydoine*, ed. C. Hippeau (Paris, 1863).

²⁶ *Richars Li Biaus*, ed. Foerster (Wien, 1874).

²⁷ *Le Roman de Rou*, ed. H. Andresen (Heilbronn, 1877-9) 2 vol.

²⁸ *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. H. Michelant (Paris, 1876).

si cointe ne si os (2108-9); NOM., Plus se fait fiers que un lupart (6174); OBL., Ves com se fait conte et gaillart (:lupart) (6173).

It is evident from this study that the oblique case is more usual in the predicate complement of reflexive verbs in Old French than has been supposed. The two questions which interest the investigator in this matter are: first, how the nominative came to be the commoner form in this type of sentence; second, whether or not the oblique can be considered a legitimate alternative.

To the first question different explanations have been offered. In regard to *soi feire* Gaston Paris says²⁹ that this verb is equivalent to *fieri*, and "traité comme un verbe neutre ordinaire." This implies that the reflexives such as *soi tenir*, *soi veoir*, *soi sentir*, and *soi feire* may be considered equivalent to *estre*, and hence the nominative is expected in the predicate complement. Another explanation may be derived from Foerster's statement regarding constructions after verbs of naming—that is, that a vocative quality is evident in such complements—for which he gives the example *traître me claiment*. He says that the nominative here used is like that used with reflexive verbs.³⁰

Therefore, as justification for the nominative case after reflexive verbs, we may consider the equivalency of the reflexive verb to *estre*, or the complement as having a vocative quality, or we may examine such cases as the following: *Lancelot*, Se part mout esmaiez (3576); *Perceval*, S'an vint montez (5467); *Aiol*, Atant s'en retournerent coureçous et iré (5145). In these examples there could be only one possible agreement of the participles; that is, they are modifiers of the subject, and hence in the nominative case. It is, then, reasonable to suppose that, as the nominative case is used with these verbs which have a reflexive pronoun and require the subject agreement, the nominative case should be used with other real reflexive verbs, such as *soi feire*, *soi veoir*, and where the adjective or participle is used as a complement.

More interesting than accounting for the nominative case as the usual form of the predicate complement is an inquiry concerning the frequent use of the oblique in the same construction. The acceptance of this form has been chiefly in connection with a single verb—*soi feire*. Mussafia considers the usage with this verb a

²⁹ *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland*, note 1, page 65.

³⁰ *Yvain*, Anmerkungen, 3619.

legitimate exception to the rule.³¹ Laubscher explains the use of the oblique as due to an early breakdown of cases. He says that when the oblique case is used, it is because the objective value after the verb is more strongly felt.³² The construction is, of course, in harmony with the Latin usage where the predicate complement takes the case of the object pronoun after reflexive verbs.

It seems doubtful if the usage is so exceptional as Mussafia would imply or if it is to be considered due to an early breakdown as Laubscher suggests. Rather it seems to be an early as well as a late, a fairly common, and a consciously accepted, alternative for the nominative usage. In documents of early enough date to distinguish the cases many examples show the oblique. Such sentences are not frequent enough to show it the preferred construction, but lead one to believe that the old writers had the sanction of usage for the oblique form and that its presence was not due to ignorance or to an error of the scribe.

The examples which have been cited show 35 oblique cases, 48 nominative cases, and 3 double constructions.³³ It is interesting to note that the 35 objectives are well scattered through the twenty odd texts considered. Some of the texts, it is true, show no examples of this form. These are: *Alexis*, *Philomena*, *Erec*, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, and *Elie de Saint Gille*. On the other hand, there are four texts from which no examples of the nominative have been quoted—*Aliscans*, *Les Narbonnais*, *Le Couronnement de Louis*, and *Le Roman de Rou*. These two groups do not, as one might suppose, represent early and late tendencies respectively, but both contain works dating early and late in the period under discussion. Nor do they represent a particular section. Only a few Anglo-French texts have been used because they are likely to show earlier confusion of the cases than do Continental French texts.

The fact that the examples are taken from verse causes one to consider how far the exigencies of poetic devices may have influenced

³¹ *Z. R. Ph.*, III (1879), 251.

³² *The Syntactical Causes of Case Reduction in Old French*, Elliott Monographs, VII (Princeton-Paris, 1921), 65.

³³ These examples, already cited, of both nominative and oblique cases following the same verb form are: *Aiol* (5083), *Amadas* (881), *Guillaume de Palerne* (2108-9). There is a fourth instance in the *Oxford Roland* (2125).

the use of the oblique case. The fact that this case sometimes occurs as a rhyme sound shows that it was intentionally chosen and not a mistake of the scribe. But the fact that Old French is rich in rhyme sounds makes it seem unlikely that the poet felt himself forced to an incorrect use of this case when a slight change of the other rhyme sounds might have obviated the difficulty. It does not seem likely, then, that the use of the oblique case is very largely due to the poetic forms used by the authors of that time.

Is it not evident that the writers of Old French had no feeling that they were violating the rules of grammar when they used the oblique case for the complement following reflexive verbs? This supposition is particularly strengthened by the examples in which a single verb is followed by both cases in the same sentence. The conclusion seems to be that while the nominative is preferred, it is only a little more frequent, and that the oblique construction may be considered a legitimate alternative.

T. G. WESENBERG.

Butler University.

THE RULES OF CIVILITY (1671) AND ITS FRENCH SOURCE

One of the most popular manuals of courtesy in England of the Restoration was a small volume entitled, in its first edition (1671), *The Rules of Civility; or, Certain Ways of Deportment Observed in France; amongst All Persons of Quality, upon Several Occasions. Translated out of French.*¹ Edward Arber's *Term Catalogues* lists four editions of the work—1671, 1673 ("The Second Edition, with Additions"), 1678, and 1703²—and three reprints—one in 1675 and two in 1704.³ The British Museum and the London Library each have a copy of an edition dated 1685 which is not mentioned in the *Term Catalogues*.

Although *The Rules of Civility* (1671) is well known to be a

¹ London. . . . 1671. I have used the Library of Congress copy of this edition.

² I, 88; I, 138; I, 322; and III, 380, respectively.

³ I, 200; III, 393; and III, 417, respectively.

translation from the French, its exact source has apparently never been identified. It is evident from M. D. Conway's references in his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility*⁴ that he knew nothing of the date, title, or author of the French original. In a recent article entitled "French Etiquette in 1682,"⁵ Miss Daisy Stepney translates into English certain passages from an edition of the French original printed at Paris in 1682, but she makes no mention either of the English translation or of earlier editions of the French source; and she is probably in error concerning the authorship.⁶ The various bibliographers who notice the English translation make no reference to its source. It is, however, a translation of an anonymous work entitled *Nouveau traité de la civilité, qui se pratique en France parmi les honnêtes gens*, which made its first appearance at Paris in 1671 and which is attributed to Antoine de Courtin (1622-1685).⁷

⁴ London, 1890, p. 17.

⁵ *French Quarterly*, VIII (1926), 132-37.

⁶ She states that "The author signs only his initials—J. M." to the letter prefixed to the work, but Barbier remarks (*Dict. des ouvrages anonymes*, III, 1875, 521 b) that "J. Meusnier ne paroît avoir été que l'éditeur des divers traités d'Ant. de Courtin."

⁷ Since this work appeared in English, German, and Latin translations (see the copy of a polyglot edition in the Newberry Library at Chicago: *Nouveau traité de la civilité qui se pratique en France, parmi les honnêtes gens. Ein neu Tractätlein von der Höfflichkeit so in Franckreich under verständigen Leuthen im Gebrauch ist. Tractatus novus de civilitate usitata in Gallia, inter homines politos*. Basel, 1671) in the year 1671, Quérard is quite obviously wrong in asserting (*sub* "Courtin, Ant." in his *La France littéraire ou dictionnaire bibliographique*) that "La première édition parut en 1675." In his *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* (III, 521 a) Barbier lists a first edition with the date 1671 and a second edition with the date 1672. The *Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la bibliothèque nationale* (XXXIII) records among others an eighth edition dated 1695 and other editions or reprints extending through the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Although all bibliographers who mention the book indicate that it is anonymous, they give no suggestion of their evidence for attributing it to Courtin. I have a copy, which was printed at Brussels without date (but since the printer, Simon T^r Sersteven, according to the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, was printing books in 1724 and 1727, it is probably safe to assume a date *ca.* 1725), and whose title-page, giving the Abbé de Bellegarde as the author, reads as follows: "Traité de la civilité ou l'éducation parfaite, qui se pratique parmi les honnêtes gens. Par Mr. l'Abbé de Bellegarde. Dernière édition. A Brux-

For much of the material in his book Courtin probably drew upon a Jesuit manual entitled *Bienséance de la conversation entre les hommes*,⁸ which was published at Pont-à-Mousson in 1617 and at Rouen in 1618. This work was in turn based on Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo* (1558).⁹ The English *Rules of Civility* (1671) is therefore three removes from one of the fountain-heads of modern courtesy—the *Galateo* of della Casa.¹⁰

Aside from its literary relations, Courtin's treatise is of interest not merely because it contains a careful treatment of the principles of civility but because it describes concretely many of the social practices of the day that are not ordinarily dealt with

elles. Chez Simon T^r Serstevens, Libraire proche les Peres Dominicains [n. d.].” If Courtin wrote the book, why have bibliographers failed to give evidence for his authorship? Or, assuming that they are correct in their attribution, did the Brussels printer, in his ignorance of the authorship of the anonymous work, attribute it to the Abbé de Bellegarde simply because Bellegarde was one of the most voluminous and most popular writers of courtesy literature in the later seventeenth century? Although the bibliographers give no evidence for the attribution to Courtin, it is probably safe to assume that since the book is nowhere mentioned among Bellegarde's works, the Brussels printer must have invented the authorship just as he altered the title.

⁸ I have been unable to secure a copy of the Jesuit manual for comparison with Courtin's work, but M. D. Conway, in his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility* (London, 1890), p. 17, points out that *The Rules of Civility*—the seventeenth century English translation of Courtin's work—“plagiarizes largely from the Jesuit manual.”

⁹ For a brief description of the Jesuit manual and a discussion of its relation to the *Galateo*, see M. Magendie, *La politesse mondaine et les théories de l'honnêteté, en France, au XVII^e siècle, de 1600 à 1660* (2 vols., Paris [1925?]), I, 159 ff.

¹⁰ The dangers which often attend an attempt to trace a work of courtesy to its source before one knows its whole family tree are shown by M. D. Conway's researches in connection with George Washington's *Rules of Civility*. Conway satisfied himself (see pp. 12 ff. of his Introduction to the *op. cit.*) that by the help of a French schoolmaster, Washington had taken his rules directly from the Jesuit manual referred to above. Charles Moore (see the Introduction to his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation*. Boston and New York, 1926) has given positive proof, however, that Washington's immediate source was not the Jesuit manual but an English version of it entitled *Youth's Behaviour* made by Francis Hawkins and first published in London in 1641.

in courtesy books of the period. A few of the more interesting passages, which are as suggestive as informing, will serve to illustrate this feature. "Pour commencer par la porte de la maison d'un Prince, ou d'un grand Seigneur," says Courtin, "c'est incivilité de heurter fort, & plus d'un coup. A la porte des Chambres ou du Cabinet, c'est bestise & manque de respect, de heurter; il faut grater" (pp. 36-7).¹¹

Il n'est aussi nullement de la politesse, de se promener dans l'anti-chambre en attendant: cela même est deffendu chez le Roy; & si on le fait, les Huissiers vous font reprimende, ou vous font sortir.

Il n'est pas de la bienveillance non plus, de chanter ou de siffler en attendant, comme l'on dit, pour se desennuyer: Ce qu'il faut aussi se garder de faire dans les ruës, ou autres lieux où il y a concours de monde (p. 45).

Il y en a même qui ayant pris le raffinement de la civilité dans quelque pais étranger n'osent ni se couvrir, ni s'asseoir le dos tourné au portrait de quelque personne de qualité eminente (p. 40).

Il ne faut point prendre de tabac en poudre, si la personne qualifiée qui est en droit d'en prendre devant nous, ne nous en presentoit familièrement; au quel cas il faut en prendre, ou en faire le semblant, si on y avoit repugnance (p. 91).

Que si elle [la personne] étoit, il ne faut pas luy dire tout haut, *Dieu vous assiste*: mais il faut seulement se découvrir, & faire une profonde reverence, faisant ce souhait interieurement (p. 97).

In a long chapter on conduct at the table the writer tells us that all guests stand "quand on dit *Benedicite* & Grace . . . & en ce (*sic*) placant avoir la teste nuë, & ne se couvrir qu'après que l'on est tout à fait assis, & que les personnes plus qualifiées sont couvertes" (p. 144). In going out of one's house to greet a visitor, "Il faut avoir alors où son épée au costé, ou son manteau sur les épaules: ou si l'on est d'épée, & que l'on soit en manteau, il faut avoir le manteau & l'épée, estant indécent de paroistre autrement" (p. 183). If upon his arrival, however, the visitor should find one in bed, "il faut y demeurer" (p. 183). If one is hunting with an eminent person ("une personne qualifiée"), "il ne faut pas la couper, ni se laisser emporter par trop d'ardeur: mais il faut la laisser arriver la première à la prise & à la mort de la beste: Et s'il faut mettre l'épée à la main, ou le pistolet pour luy donner le dernier coup, il faut laisser cet honneur à la

¹¹ This and the following passages are quoted from the polyglot edition referred to above.

personne qualifiée" (pp. 212-13). The author gives much advice on letter-writing:

Il est à remarquer pour la ceremonie de l'écriture, qu'il est plus respectueux de se servir de grand papier, que de petit; & que le papier sur lequel on écrit doit estre double, & non en simple demi-feuille, quand on n'écriroit à la premiere page que six lignes. Qu'après le *Monseigneur* ou le *Monsieur* que l'on met au commencement d'une lettre, on laisse beaucoup de blanc avant que d'écrire le corps de la lettre, differemment pourtant, selon la qualité des personnes (pp. 217-18).

Il est bon aussi de scavoir, que pour plus de respect on met la lettre dans une enveloppe sur laquelle on met le dessus: Et pour les Dames, on cachette les lettres avec de la soye en mettant le dessus sur la lettre même; ce qui s'observe à l'égard des Dames de la plus grande qualité, si ce n'est que pour marque d'un plus grand respect, on peut mettre la lettre déjà cachettée de soye, dans une enveloppe, sur laquelle on met encore le dessus (pp. 225-6).

From a comparison of a copy of the first edition of *The Rules of Civility* (1671) with the French of the polyglot edition referred to above (which, since it was printed before the appearance of the second edition of the original, must have been a reprint of the first edition), it is evident that the English translator (or translators) has followed his original rather closely. Although he not infrequently paraphrases passages in the earlier chapters on the theory of civility, he is careful to give a close, almost literal, rendering of the rules themselves. The only striking variation I have discovered in his translation occurs in Chapter VII, which treats of the gentleman's conduct at church. Here the English version contains certain references to church ceremonies which do not appear in the Basel polyglot version. The Brussels edition *ca.* 1725) of Courtin's work referred to above has, however, several rules relating to Roman Catholic ceremony which do not appear in the English translation. A collation of the three versions leads one to conclude that whereas the Basel printer omitted all passages relating to church ceremonies, the English translator omitted only such passages as applied to the Roman Catholic ceremony rather than to that of the Church of England.

Not only does the English translator follow his original closely, but he is evidently careful to keep abreast of the various changes made in later editions of the original. The very titles of his several editions indicate that he kept in close touch with the suc-

cessive editions of the French original and took advantage of the various enlargements of the latter work to bring out new editions in English. Thus in the *Term Catalogues* for 6 May, 1673 (I, 138), is listed "The Second Edition, with Additions"; under date of 22 June, 1678 (I, 322), another edition is described as "Newly revised, and very much enlarged, according to a new Edition lately Printed in *France*"; and in December, 1703 (III, 380), is mentioned still another edition as "Newly done out of the Twelfth Edition in French." This edition is twice listed under "Reprints."

The fact that a number of enlarged editions of the French tract were published in English over a period of more than thirty years is, I think, significant of the demand during the period for French works of courtesy; and the care of the translator (or translators) to give a close rendering of the French and his readiness to incorporate into a new English edition enlargements made in the French original may possibly be regarded as additional evidence of the admiration Englishmen of the later seventeenth century had for French manners and social standards.

VIRGIL B. HELTZEL

Northwestern University.

THE DATE OF *THE NOBLE GENTLEMAN*

The recorded stage history of *The Noble Gentleman* begins on February 3, 1626, on which date it was licensed as by John Fletcher. Twenty-one years later it appeared in the first folio of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays, preceded by a prologue which implies that the play is the work of both Beaumont and Fletcher and states that it was popular "twenty years agoe."¹ Only two efforts have been made to date the play. Oliphant, thinking he recognized in it the hand of Beaumont, dated it "about 1607," but added in a footnote:

¹ The evidence of this prologue is, of course, of no value. It has been noted that the same prologue was prefixed to the 1649 quarto of *Thierry and Theodoret*.

That the play has not come down to us in its original form is abundantly evident; but whether the alterations were made by Massinger (? and W. Rowley) in '25-26 on the original work of B. and F., or by F. (? about '12 or '16) on the original work if B., I cannot say.²

Weber, judging doubtless by the date of the license that the play was never acted until after Fletcher's death, conjectured that "being left imperfect by that poet, some of his friends finished it, perhaps Shirley."³ Dyce and Fleay, though they would substitute others instead of Shirley as the redactor, have accepted Weber's suggestion that the play was left unfinished by Fletcher.⁴

It is, of course, quite impossible to prove either of these views erroneous. I believe, however, that I shall demonstrate that *The Noble Gentleman* either was originally composed or was revised in late 1621 or early 1622. If Fletcher was the original author and if he was at that time working on the play, does it not contradict all we know of Fletcher to assume that he would for three or four years leave the play in its unfinished state? Would not Fletcher, if he were for any reason unable to complete the play, have turned it over to one or more of his many assistants?

That the play was being composed or revised between 1619 and 1622 is, I think, shown by a speech by Clerimont in Act I, scene i. Monsieur Marine is urging his cousin to send his wife to court, and Clerimont replies:

Sir, I had rather send her to *Virginia*
To help to propagate the *English Nation*.

This reply is, I think, clearly a reference to an organized movement to transport women to the colony. Before 1626, when the play was licensed, only one such movement is recorded. The records of the Virginia Company show that this movement was not thought

² *Englische Studien*, xv (1891), 340 n. Since 1891 Mr. Oliphant has devoted much study to the Beaumont and Fletcher plays. I believe he hopes shortly to publish his present views, which probably differ in many respects from those expressed in 1891.

³ Quoted by Dyce, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, Boston, 1854, II, 677.

⁴ Bullen (*D. N. B.*) and Macaulay (*Camb. Hist.*, vi, 158), who do not recognize the hand of Fletcher in the play, offer no suggestions as to the date. Thorndike dates it "1625?"

of until late 1619 and that it was completed two years later. I quote at length from the records of the Company so that the reader may see how exactly the purpose of the Company corresponded to that expressed by Clerimont—"to propagate the *English Nation*"—, may judge how much publicity such a movement would receive and how a reference to it might provoke laughter, and may understand more fully my reasons for believing that the play was originally composed or was revised in 1621 or 1622.

The advisability of transporting women to the colony was first suggested to the Company on November 3, 1619:

As in the last Court Mr Deputy acquaynted them of mr Threasurer so he being now present it pleased him to relate, that although to the time giuen him by the Companies orders he had beene absent yet he hath not beene idle to Virginia, as he will giue Accompt of: And therefore he had to offer to their consideracion a Proposicion for the inlarging of the Plantation in the publique. And first touching the Publique, he shewed how farr the Company had allready proceeded. first in Ianuary last there went fifty men wth Sr George Yeardly to be Tenants of the Gouvernors land, whereof there failed by the way two or three, and six were now remayning to him of Capt Argolls garde. Afterward in Aprill next twenty men should haue beene sent by Xofer Lawne vnto the Common Land, but he deliuered but 15 because the Company performed not wth him, touching the Loane of Corne and Cattle as he expected: Then 4 more were sent in the Triall according to the direccion of his Matie. And in the begining of August Last, one hundreth more—50—to the Colledge Land and 50 to the Common: And for one hundreth persons or thereabout wch appeareth to haue beene sent in these 2 or 3 last yeares at the Companies charges, Sr Geo: Yeardley writeth of but three to be found remayning for the Company; So that there is by this Account vpon the Common Land 72 persons, 53 on the Gouvernors, and 50 on the Colledges: 175 in the whole. Therefore he proposed now to be considered of against the Quarter Court this fortnight that there be sent the next spring 130 men more, wch will make those allready sent for the Gouvernor Colledge, and Common Land the full number of Three hundred, . . .

. . . He also thought it fitt to send 100 more to be Prentizes or Servants that the rest may goe on more cheerefully, wherein he hoped the citty would deale as worthily as heretofore. Lastly he wished that a fitt hundreth might be sent of woemen, Maids young and vncorrupt to make wifes to the Inhabitants and by that meanes to make the men there more settled & lesse moueable who by defect thereof (as is credibly reported) stay there but to gett something and then to returne for England, wch will breed a dissolucion, and so an ouerthrow of the Plantacion. These woemen if they marry to the

Publique ffarmors, to be transported at the charges of the Company; If otherwise, then those that takes them to wife to pay the said Company their charges of transportacion, and it was neuer fitter time to send them then nowe.⁵

The Records show that the proposition was accordingly brought before the Quarter Court a fortnight later:

. . . And because he vnderstood that the people thither transported, though seated there in their persons for some fewe yeares, are not settled in their mindes to make it their place of rest and continuance, but hauing gotten some wealth there, to returne againe into England: ffor the remedying of that mischiefe, and establishing of a perpetuitie to the Plantation, he aduised and made it his Third Proposicion, to send them ouer One hundreth young Maides to become wives; that wives, chiildren and familie might make them lesse moueable and settle them, together with their Posteritie in that Soile.⁶

There was, however, considerable delay in completing the arrangements for sending the women to Virginia. Twenty months later none had been sent, for it was not until the meeting of July 16, 1621, that the Company made plans for financing their transportation. The records of the Company under that date show that

flower seuerall Rolls were now read and offered to such as would please to vnderwrite The first being for a Magazine of Apparrell, and other necessary provisions such as the Colony stood in great need of; The Second for sendinge of 100: mayds to be made wives; . . .⁷

Although this delay in transporting the women may have been in part due to the unwillingness of those selected—as was the delay in sending the one hundred apprentices or servants—, such unwillingness, I believe, can hardly explain a delay of two years. Two months after it had been first suggested that one hundred prentices and one hundred maids be sent to the colony, the one hundred prentices had been selected and the Company had petitioned the government for special authority to use force upon

⁵ *The Records of the Virginia Company of London*, edited by Susan Myra Kingsbury. 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906, I, 255-257.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

those unwilling to leave England.* Two years, however, have passed before we learn that any women had been sent. In July 1621, as seen from the record quoted above, plans were made for financing their transportation, and at the meeting of November 21, 1621, it is noted that sixty maids had been sent.

The Third Roll was for sendinge of Mayds to Virginia to be made Wyues, wch the Planters there did verie much desire by the want of whome haue sprange the greatest hinderances of the encrease of the Plantacion, in that most of them esteeming Virginia not as a place of Habitacion but onely of a short sojourninge haue applied themselues and their labors wholly to the raisinge of present proffitt and vtterly neglected not only staple Commodities but euen the verie necessities of mans life, in regard whereof and to preuent so great an inconvenience hereafter whereby the Planters minds may be the faster tyed to Virginia by the bonds of Wyues and Children, care hath bin taken to provide them younge handsome and honestly educated maids whereof 60 are already sent to Virginia being such as were specially recommended vnto the Companie for their good bringinge vp by their parents or friends of good worth: wch mayds are to be disposed in marriage to the most honest and industrious Planters who are to defraye and satisfie to the Aduenturors the charges of their passages and prouisions at such rats as they and the Aduenturors Agents there shall agree and in case any of them faile through mortality it is ordered that a proporcionable addicion shalbe made vpon the rest, In the furtherance of wch Christian Accion diuers of the said Aduenturors had vnderwritt diuers good sommes of money none vnder 8li whereby the whole Some of that Roll did already amount to 800li as may appeare by the subscriptions.⁹

As I have said, this was the only organized effort to send women to Virginia during the life of the Virginia Company. The Company, of course, passed out of existence in 1624, a little more than a year before *The Noble Gentleman* was licensed; but during the interim there is no reference in the *Calendar of State Papers (Colonial)* which suggests another shipment of women. The crown, under which the colony passed upon the dissolution of the Company, was indeed notoriously uninterested in the welfare of the colonies and much less active than the Company had been in their development.

* See the letter of Sir E. Sandys to Secretary Robert Naunton asking for such special authority. *Domestic Corresp. Jac. I.*, Vol. CXII., No. 49, Cal. p. 118. (*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, Jan. 28, 1620.)

⁹ *Op cit.*, I, 566.

If I am correct in thinking that Clerimont refers to the publicity accompanying an organized movement to transport women to Virginia, the reference must, in order to have furnished any amusement, have been written between December 1619 and early 1622. Because of the long delay in shipping the women and because the plans for financing their transportation were not completed until the middle of 1621, I am inclined to believe that the Company did not give publicity to their efforts to secure women prior to the beginning of the year 1621. The reference in the play indicates, I think, a date very close to the actual shipping of the maids.

Possibly there is confirmatory evidence for dating the play 1621-22 in the use of the name Shattillion for the "Lord mad for Love," who imagines the king suspects him of plotting for the throne. Ordinarily there would, of course, be no necessity for an explanation of the choice of this name; the family of Chatillon had for centuries been prominent in French history and closely connected with the royal family. However, as other evidence indicates that the play was being worked on in 1621-1622, it seems possible—to me even probable—that the name Shattillion was suggested by the appearance in 1621 of André du Chesne's *Histoire généalogique de la maison de Chastillon-sur-Marne*. If the name of the mad lord was suggested by the publication of this history, *The Noble Gentleman* must, I think, have been composed rather than revised in 1621-1622.¹⁰

BALDWIN MAXWELL.

University of Iowa.

¹⁰ Unfortunately I have not been able to consult du Chesne's *Histoire*. Possibly the author (or authors) of *The Noble Gentleman* made use of du Chesne, although the close resemblance of the Shattillion plot to the story of the Passionate Madman in *Nice Valour* makes me think it unlikely that the *Histoire* could have been the source of any of the incidents in the play.

A NOTE ON *EASTWARD HO*, I, ii, 178

In the second scene of the first act of *Eastward Ho*, Touchstone asks Golding, "How dost thou like the knight, Sir Flash? does he not looke bigge? howe likst thou the elephant? he sayes he has a castle in the countrey." And Golding replies, "Pray heaven, the elephant carry not his castle on his backe."

Commenting on this passage in his notes to the Belles-Lettres edition of this play, Professor Schelling remarks, "Gallants often impoverished their estates by the costliness of their garments"; and while this meaning was doubtless implicit in Golding's line, a supplementary foot-note referring to the "elephant and castle" might have been made when Professor Schelling reprinted the play in his *Typical Elizabethan Plays* (1926). For Golding's line elicited a commendation from Touchstone—"Fore heaven, very well!"—which shows that a double meaning was here understood.

To the Elizabethan public, the elephant and castle was a well-known pageant.¹ In the Duke of Newcastle's *Country Captain* (1649) is a reference to it: "Thou fence before the Pageants & make roome for the porters, when like Elephants they carry once a yeare the Cyttie Castles" (Cf. *English Pageantry*, I, p. 67, n. 1 [on p. 68]). The elephant, in the Middle Ages, was nearly always represented with a castle on his back (Larwood and Hotton, *History of Signboards*, p. 155, cited in *Eng. Pag.*, I, p. 68, n. 1); the device is on the seal of Coventry, and was commonly used by the cutlers as a sign, it being the crest of the Cutlers' Company, on account of the ivory used in their trade. References to this arm of the Indian forces are found in mediæval romances, whence the figure may have come into pageantry direct, or through trade; and from pageantry, it became a popular inn-sign, as did the Green Man. (Cf. the references from *Martin Chuzzlewit*, cited in *Eng. Pag.*, I, p. 69 and n. 1). It was, at one time, the form of the "castle" in chess; and to the references in *English Pageantry* may be added this passage from *Vanity Fair* (Ch. XXXVIII): "He ordered and sent . . . a

¹ In Professor Parrott's edition of the comedies of Chapman (1913) which includes this play (see the notes, under I, ii, 147-8), he observes that the elephant was constantly depicted with a castle on his back, but gives no reason for this.

grand ivory set of chessmen from China. The pawns were little green and white men, with real swords and shields; the knights were on horseback; the castles were on the backs of elephants."² Perhaps the intricacies of the elephant were too much for European carvers; at any rate, it is worth noting that in more modern Occidental sets of chessmen the castle is the only piece who might not be supposed to be alive. Dickens was doubtless thinking of the inn-sign in the passages from *Martin Chuzzlewit* alluded to above; and it was an inn which gave the name Elephant and Castle to a district of London.

Golding undoubtedly referred to this popular piece of pageantry when he made his remark, as well as to the indigence of "Sir Flash." Later on (Act II, sc. iii) Sir Petronel admits to Quicksilver that he has no castle: "O, Frank, my castle! Alas, all the castles I have are built with air, thou knowest!" and Touchstone (Act IV, sc. ii) desires his daughter, Lady Flash, to "return in quest of your bright and most transparent castle." She laments (Act V, sc. i) that "all my knight's living lies i' the Counter. . . . There's his castle now!" In the epilogue is a reference to the Lord Mayor's Show. Quicksilver says: ". . . See, if the streets and the fronts of the houses be not stuck with people, and the windows filled with ladies, as on the solemn day of the Pageant!"

O may you find in this our pageant here,
The same contentment which you came to seek;
And as that show but draws you once a year,
May this attract you hither once a week.

From Peele's Lord Mayor's Show of 1585 to the closing of the theatres, several well-known dramatists had a hand in planning these civic spectacles.

ROBERT WITHINGTON.

Smith College.

² Cf. *Dombey and Son*, ch. xii: "Paul's chair was next to Miss Blimber; but it being found, when he sat in it, that his eyebrows were not much above the level of the tablecloth, some books were brought in from the Doctor's study, on which he was elevated, and on which he always sat from that time—carrying them in and out himself on after occasions, like a little elephant and castle."

GLEANINGS OF CHURCHILL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mr. Joseph M. Beatty's recent article, "Churchill's Influence on Minor Eighteenth Century Satirists,"¹ opens an interesting subject. The present paper merely adds a few notes to the extensive bibliography published by Mr. Beatty.

Identification of the authors of anonymous pamphlets is not always easy. But a few of the satires listed by Mr. Beatty as anonymous may be associated with particular poets or poetasters upon fairly reliable evidence. The *Anti-Rosciad* (1761) has been attributed to Thomas Morell.² The *Meretriciad* (1761), which Mr. Fuess ascribes to Arthur Murphy and Mr. Beatty ascribes to "R. Thompson," is regularly placed to the credit, or discredit, of Edward Thompson.³ The *Conciliad* (1761), which reached a fourth edition in 1762, is sometimes attributed to W. Samson. The *Four Farthing Candles* (1762) was written by Cuthbert Shaw.⁴ *Churchill Defended* (1765) was probably written by Percival Stockdale,⁵ to whom, likewise, *Patriotism* (1765) has been somewhat dubiously attributed. The *Laureat* (1765) is the work of Edward Burnaby Greene, who also wrote *Poetical Essays* (1772).⁶ *Characters* (1766) is almost certainly the work of Francis Gentleman.⁷ *The Powers of the Pen* (1766) was written by the Rev. Evan Lloyd.⁸ *The Hobby Horse* (1766) is regularly ascribed to John Potter.⁹

May not *The Hamiltoniad* (Philadelphia, 1804), which is doubtfully attributed to J. R. Hopkins, be identical with *The Hamiltoniad* (Boston, 1804) that was reprinted by the Hamilton Club in New York in 1866? If so, it was the work of John Williams,

¹ *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XLII, 1927, 162-176.

² Fuess, C. M., *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse* (New York, 1912), 19.

³ See the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁴ Also *D. N. B.*, account of Shaw by Thomas Seccombe.

⁵ Stonehill, Block, and Stonehill, *Anonyma and Pseudonyma* (London, 1926).

⁶ *D. N. B.*, article by Gordon Goodwin.

⁷ *D. N. B.*, article by Joseph Knight.

⁸ *D. N. B.*, article by Thomas Seccombe.

⁹ *D. N. B.*, account of John Potter (fl. 1759-1804) by Gerald Le Grys Norgate.

the notorious "Anthony Pasquin" at whom William Gifford aimed a casual stroke in his *Epistle to Peter Pindar* (1800).

There is evidence in favor of slight changes in some of the data in Mr. Beatty's list. The author of *The Authors* (1766) was apparently Hayes rather than Haynes. The first edition of *The Race* was published in 1765. The first part of Kelly's *Thespis* was issued in 1766. A *Parody on the Rosciad of Churchill* was noticed by the *Monthly Review* in 1781, but was issued in 1780.¹⁰ On the other hand, Mr. Beatty was apparently quite right in dating *The Meretriciad* 1761 in spite of the fact that J. K. Laughton in the article on Edward Thompson in the *Dictionary of National Biography* asserts that *The Meretriciad* was published in 1755.

The following titles supplement Mr. Beatty's extensive list of works that show the influence of Churchill:

The Triumvirate: A poetical Portrait. Taken from the Life, and finished after the Manner of Swift. By Veritas, an unknown Hand. (London, 1761.)¹¹

(Pye, Henry J. ?) *The Apology, Addressed to the Reviewers, By ———, Esq., Author of The Rosciad of Covent Garden.* (London, 1762.)¹²

(Thompson, E.) *The Courtesan. By the Author of the Meretriciad.* (London, 1765.)¹³

Verses occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Mr. Churchill. (Edinburgh, [1764 or 1765].)¹⁴

Roscius: or, A critical Examination into the Merits of all the principal Performers belonging to the Norwich Theatre. For last Season. (London, 1767.)

Churchill, W. *The Temple of Corruption. A Poem.* (London, 1770.)¹⁵
An Essay on Woman; a Poem. (London, 1772.)¹⁶

¹⁰ See the copy in the Wrenn Library at the University of Texas.

¹¹ The Triumvirs were Churchill, Coleman, and Lloyd. This amusing skit, a copy of which is to be seen in the Wrenn Library at the University of Texas, belongs in the series with Murphy's *Ode to the Naiads of Fleet Ditch*.

¹² *Monthly Review*, xxvi, 473.

¹³ The author boasts acquaintance with Churchill.

¹⁴ A sixpenny pamphlet noted in the *Scots Magazine* for January, 1765 (xxvii, 39).

¹⁵ The author is said, in an advertisement, to be a brother of Charles Churchill. D. N. B. gives no information about a brother whose initial was W.

¹⁶ Sometimes attributed to "Rev. S. Johnson," this attack on Wilkes was noticed in the *Monthly Review* (xlvi, 410) as comparable in style to

The Resurrection of Liberty, or Advice to the Colonists, a Poem. By the Ghost of Churchill. (London, 1774.)¹⁷

The Stage of Aristophanes. (London, 1774.)¹⁸

Theatrical Portraits. (Epigrammatically delineated, wherein the merits and demerits of most of our stage heroes and heroines are excellently painted by some of our best masters.) (London, 1774.)¹⁹

The Drama; a Poem. (London, 1775.)

(Pratt, Samuel Jackson.) *Garrick's Looking-glass; or The Art of Rising on the Stage. A Poem, in three Cantos, Decorated with dramatic Characters. By the Author of ———.* (London, 1776.)

Mr. Beatty concludes his study at the year 1783, asserting that in that year the influence of Churchill was rapidly waning. But he includes in his list a few titles of later publications, and to these the following may be added:

"Anthony Pasquin" (Williams, John). *The Children of Thespis; a Poem. Part I.* (London, 1786.)

As You Like It. A Poem addressed to a Friend. (London, 1785.)²⁰

The Garriciad, a Poem; being a Companion to the Rosciad of Churchill. By a Gentleman. (London, 1787.)

The New Rosciad. [London, 1787?]²¹

(Williams, John.) *The Children of Thespis. Parts II and III.* (London, 1788.)

The Modern Stage Exemplified, in an Epistle to a Young Actor, Part I. (London, 1788.)²²

A Trip to Parnassus; or, The Judgment of Apollo on Dramatic Authors and Performers. A Poem. (London, 1788.)²³

some of the works of Churchill. The title of the piece tempts one to a bibliographical digression concerning the scandalous *Essay on Woman* (1763) written by Thomas Potter and privately printed for Wilkes, to whom it was generally ascribed. It was the subject of a violent pamphlet war and the object of several more or less scurrilous imitations.

¹⁷ *Gentleman's Magazine*, XLIV, 533.

¹⁸ "An account of the summer-actors at Foote's theatre in the Haymarket," this piece is noticed in the *Monthly Review*, LI, 483.

¹⁹ The reviewer (*Monthly Review*, LII, 353-354) compares this "list of actors" to the *Rosciad* but says it is "not very severe or smart."

²⁰ In the *Monthly Review*, LXIII, 72, this poem is said to be "full of Churchill's rage."

²¹ This title appears in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LVII, 524. The poem may be identical with that issued under the same title in 1785.

²² Called a "pseudo-Rosciad" by a reviewer for the *European Magazine*, XIV, 114-115.

²³ This piece was written by a woman, and may have more of the "Ses-

Liverpool Odes, or Affectionate Epistles for the Year 1793. By Junius Churchill, Esq.²⁴

"The Stage" in *Verses on Various Occasions.* (London, 1795.)

The Druriad; or, Strictures on the principal Performers of Drury-lane Theatre. A Satirical Poem; with Notes Critical and Explanatory. (London, 1798.)

Burton, W. *A Pasquinade on the Performers of the York Company.* By W. Burton, Comedian. (Leeds, 1801.)

The Young Rosciad, an admonitory Poem, well seasoned with Attic Salt, cum notis variorum. By Peter Panglos, Esq., LL.D. and A.S.S. (London, 1805.)

Mr. Beatty is of the opinion that in 1783 "Churchill's posthumous influence upon the minor controversial writers . . . was rapidly waning" and "sustained satire in verse was giving way to the pamphlet and to short satirical songs."²⁵ It is quite true that the fashions in satire change. In the decade after Churchill's death the light, anapestic verses of Christopher Anstey found many imitators. In the second decade, the *Heroic Epistles* of William Mason exerted a strong influence. In the third decade, there were many odes upon the model of Peter Pindar's pleasantries.²⁶ In the last five years of the century, Gifford and Mathias were largely

sion of Poets" than of the *Rosciad* in its composition. It is noticed in the *Monthly Review*, LXXVIII, 241.

²⁴ *British Critic*, III, 85.

²⁵ *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XLII, 170 and 171. On page 162, Mr. Beatty remarks that "sustained satire persisted until about 1775, when it gradually gave place to the satirical ballad, the ode, and the pamphlet." As a matter of fact, probably as many satires in verse were separately published in English in 1778 as in any other year after the flurry that immediately followed the death of Pope. At least fifty were published in 1788, and while most of that number were in the form of Petro-Pindaric odes, there were among them pieces with such heroic titles as *The Controversiad*, *The Lousiad*, *The Odiad*, and *The Patriad*.

²⁶ An amusing illustration of the mixture of influences is to be found in "Matthew Bramble's" *Odes to Actors*, the matter of a *Rosciad* in a style compounded of Peter Pindar and watergruel. The odes are reprinted in the first sixty pages of *The Miscellaneous Works of A. M'Donald; including the Tragedy of Vimonda, and those publications which have appeared under the signature of Matthew Brambles, Esq., with various other compositions by the same author.* (London, 1791.) On page 49, "Bramble" hails Woods as "Caledonia's Roscius."

responsible for the new vogue of the Juvenalian satire in heroic couplets. But surely the titles listed above indicate that to the very end of the century the influence of Churchill persisted.

ROBERT C. WHITFORD.

Knox College.

THE SOURCE OF A NOTE IN JOHNSON'S EDITION OF *MACBETH*

In *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare: One Aspect*¹ Professor Karl Young notes that in several cases Johnson shows some indebtedness to Charlotte Lennox's *Shakespear Illustrated*. This book, in which Mrs. Lennox presents the sources for fourteen of Shakespeare's plays and compares eight of the history plays with their sources, Professor Young conjectures she undertook at the suggestion of Johnson, who wished to save himself the laborious study of sources which he had promised in his proposals. Professor Young points out that Johnson mentions Mrs. Lennox's book only three times in his edition of Shakespeare, although he has several times used the information she contributed without mentioning her name. I should like to call attention to another case where Johnson seems, at least indirectly, to be indebted to Mrs. Lennox for a note in his edition of Shakespeare.

On the first day of March, 1760, was published the first number of *The Lady's Museum* by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox. It continued to appear through eleven numbers, the last one advertised for February 3, 1761. This periodical is very scarce, the Yale Library having the only known copy complete in two volumes, although the library of the University of Chicago has volume II. The magazine is not included in the Crane-Kaye *Census of British Periodicals and Newspapers 1620-1800*. In volume I, pp. 409-11 of *The Lady's Museum*, there is printed a contribution signed C. D., concerning that much-discussed passage in *Macbeth*, Macduff's line in the last act, "He has no children." Part of this letter I will reprint here.

¹ *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, 1924, No. 18, 147-227.

... The expression, *He has no children*, is supposed and understood to refer to Macbeth, who having no children, could not afford to Macduff an adequate revenge. The supposition undoubtedly is natural ... but the fact is not true. Macbeth had a son, his name was Luthlac. After the death of his father he was extremely troublesome to Malcolm: he claimed the crown; and though a very weak deficient man, he answered the intentions of a rebellious party. ... In less than three months the usurper Luthlac was slain by Malcolm: then, and not till then, ended the race of Macbeth.

From hence it evidently appears that the sentence, *He has no children*, cannot refer to Macbeth. At whom then is it pointed? At Malcolm. The heart-struck Macduff heard with patience the consolatory advice administered by his royal master; but well knew, and could not avoid expressing to himself, that as Malcolm had no children he could little judge of that torrent of grief with which Macduff must naturally be overwhelmed, at the loss of his wife, and *all his pretty ones*.

Malcolm was not married; he could not feel the throbs of a parent's heart, or the anguish of an husband's love. To him the sweet and inexpressible sensations of nuptial happiness were unknown: he was ignorant of the decent pride, the rising hopes, the alluring prospects that occupy, and swell alternately a father's breast. ...

In this view, I think, Shakespeare displays his own character, and reveals his own sentiments as a parent. If the sentence had referred solely to Macbeth (supposing he had no children) it carries with it rage, fury, and revenge? If to Malcolm, it is the reflection of a wise, considerate man, who is thankful to his friend for his advice, but conscious that that advice is, for the present, to no purpose.

In his edition of Shakespeare (1765), five years after this letter was printed in *The Lady's Museum*, Johnson has this note on the passage:

He has no children—It has been observed by an anonymous critick, that this is not said of Macbeth, who had children, but of Malcolm, who having none, supposes a father can be so easily comforted.

This seems a neat summary of C. D.'s letter. If Johnson did not read "Charlotte's book" himself, it is probable that Mrs. Lennox called to his attention this Shakespearean note from her publication.

MIRIAM R. SMALL.

Wells College.

THE FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATOR OF *WERTHER*

On the death of Daniel Malthus, the father of the economist, an obituary notice in the *Monthly Magazine* for February, 1800, attributed to him English translations of *Werther*, *Paul et Virginie*, and a treatise on landscape by d'Ermenonville, all published by James Dodsley.¹ Thomas Robert Malthus immediately denied these ascriptions,² but later writers on the fortunes of *Werther* in England have usually accepted Daniel Malthus as the translator of the 1779 *Sorrows of Werter*.³ Carré has recently written of this version as William Render's⁴; this error is corrected in some valuable notes on Carré's *Werther* section by Arthur E. Turner, who goes on to say that the translation of 1779 is either by Daniel Malthus "or, as appears to me more likely, by Rev. Richard Graves, tutor of T. R. Malthus."⁵ Lack of space doubtless prevented further discussion of the point.

It now appears beyond peradventure that the 1779 version was from the pen of Graves. The 911th Caxton Head Catalogue⁶ records his autograph receipt for £40 paid by James Dodsley for the copyright of *The Sorrows of Werter*, 20 June, 1780. Dodsley has added a note: "Mr. Graves afterwards recd. as much more as made it 200£." As Turner implies, the association of Graves and the Malthus family probably lies behind the mistaken attribution in the *Monthly Magazine*. Although Graves was known for a novelist himself, and held unclerically liberal views about fiction,⁷

¹ IX, 94.

² IX, 200.

³ Cf. Orie W. Long, "English Translations of Goethe's *Werther*," *JEGP*, XIV (1915), 173, and references there given; B. Q. Morgan, *A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation* (Madison, 1922), p. 175; Anton Kippenberg, "Die erste englische Ausgabe des *Werther*," *Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg*, v (1925), 13-21.

⁴ *Goethe en Angleterre* (Paris [1920]), pp. 3, 16; *Bibliographie de Goethe en Angleterre* (Paris, 1920), p. 9.

⁵ *MLR*, xvi (1921), 367.

⁶ London: Tregaskis, 1925.

⁷ In *Columella* (London, 1779), pp. 245-48, Graves defends the writing of novels by clergymen, and in *Eugenius* (London, 1786), I, 10-11, he praises sentimental fiction. See also the general defence of prose fiction in

he was no doubt chary of associating his name with the "apology for suicide" that took England by storm in the 1780's. But his secret was known, it seems, to at least one man of letters in his neighborhood. Carré has recently reprinted, without following the clue, a statement by the Rev. Edward Mangin: "The English translation of the 'Sorrows of Werter' is by the Rev. Richard Greaves [*sic*], of Claverton, near Bath."⁸ And Frederick Shum, in his *Catalogue of Bath Books*, records the translation among Graves's works.⁹ Shum's copy is described as bearing the autograph of Edward Mangin, and his ascription of the work to Graves may rest upon Mangin's authority.

There is further evidence to connect Graves with this version of *Werther* and to show his interest in the ethical problems which the story raised. To the 1784 and many later editions of this translation was appended an anonymous set of lackadaisical verses called *Werter to Charlotte (A little before his Death)*, beginning "O Charlotte! Charlotte! all-accomplish'd maid."¹⁰ The lines labor the point, put more succinctly later by Thackeray, that Werther is a "moral man," and go on to anticipate a chaste reunion in heaven. It should be noted that these verses, the most widely circulated of English *Wertheriaden*, are by Graves. They are included in the miscellany called *Lucubrations* which he published in 1786 under the pen-name of "Peter of Pontefract."¹¹ In this collection he has also a poem *On Suicide*, beginning "Rash youth, forbear! O lay that poniard by," placed immediately after *Werter to Charlotte*, and evidently designed as an antidote to the dangerous effect which *Werther* was said to have on romantic and splenetic English youth.

Does love, like Werter's, thy fond breast inspire?
 Let reason quench, at once, th' adult'rous fire:
 Nor think t' intrude amidst the blest above,
 A soul defil'd with sin and guilty love.¹²

"The Apology, or a Word to the Wise," prefixed to *The Spiritual Quixote* (London, 1773), I, v-vi.

⁸ *The Parlour-Window* (1841), pp. 83-84, quoted by Carré, *Bibliographie*, p. 29.

⁹ Bath, 1913, p. 93.

¹⁰ This piece is to be distinguished from another less widely circulated *Werter to Charlotte*, by Edward Taylor, also first published in 1784. Taylor's lines begin, "Lost to the world, to all its pleasures lost."

¹¹ London: J. Dodsley, pp. 199-201.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

This poem, too, found a place in at least one edition of Graves's translation, that of 1789.

The Rector of Claverton may therefore claim a place in the history of fiction not only as the author of *The Spiritual Quixote* but as the first English translator of *Werther*.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

The Rice Institute.

THE EVE OF ST. AGNES AND THE LAY OF THE LAST
MINSTREL

I wish to make a suggestion that coincidences exist between *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* and two passages in *The Eve of St. Agnes*; first, the famous stanzas of the moon-lit stained-glass window, and second, the obscure line, "clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray." The lines of Keats are familiar to all. The passage in Scott is this:

Spreading herbs, and flowerets bright,
Glistened with the dew of night;
Nor herb, nor floweret, glistened there,
But was carved in the cloister-arches as fair. . . .
They entered now the chancel tall;
The darkened roof rose high aloof
On pillars lofty and light and small. . . .
Full many a scutcheon and banner riven,
Shook to the cold night-wind of heaven,
Around the screened altar's pale;
And there the dying lamps did burn. . . .
The moon on the east oriel shone
Through slender shafts of shapely stone,
By foliated tracery combined;
Thou would'st have thought some fairy's hand
Twixt poplars straight the ozier wand,
In many a freakish knot, had twined;
Then framed a spell, when the work was done,
And changed the willow-wreaths to stone.
The silver light, so pale and faint,
Shewed many a prophet, and many a saint,
Whose image on the glass was dyed;
Full in the midst, his Cross of Red
Triumphant Michael brandished,

And trampled the Apostate's pride.
The moon-beam kissed the holy pane,
And threw on the pavement a bloody stain.

Scott has "herbs" and "flowerets" and "foliated tracery" and "ozier wand in many a freakish knot"; Keats has "carven imag'ries Of fruits, and flowers, and bunches of knot-grass." Scott has "silver light" showing "many a prophet, many a saint," and "full in the midst" the Cross of Red; Keats has "innumerable of stains and spendid dyes" and "in the midst . . . saints, . . . a shielded scutcheon." Scott, it will be noticed, has "full many a scutcheon," which, with the banners that "shook to the cold night-wind" to the light of "the dying lamps," and "the scrolls that teach thee to live and to die" (mentioned in the first section of canto two) may be what Keats remembered as "dim enblazonings." Scott has "the moon on the east oriel shone"; Keats, "full on this casement shone the wintry moon." Scott does not say "wintry moon" but he speaks of "pale moonlight," and cold light, in the first section, and the cold night-wind in the portion quoted above. In Scott's poem the moon-beam throws from Michael's Cross of Red "on the pavement a bloody stain." Keats enlarges upon his description of Madeline and specifies the several colors thrown by the diamond panes on the various parts of her body. In addition to these details there is the general similarity of impression between Madeline's chamber (which is much more like a church than a chamber) and the "chancel tall" with its roof rising "high aloof on pillars lofty and light and small," which impression Keats conveys with his "casement high and triple arch'd."

Following in the next stanza but one of *The Eve of St. Agnes* is the much discussed line quoted above, "clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray." Immediately following the window passage in Scott's poem is the narrative told by the Monk of St. Mary's Aisle to Deloraine, in which the Monk states:

I was not always a man of woe;
For Paynim countries I have trod.

He states also that in these far Paynim climes he had met "the wondrous Michael Scott," the wizard who, repenting on his death-bed, had bequeathed to the Monk the care of his "Mighty Book." And, says the Monk,

I swore to bury his Mighty Book,
That never mortal might therein look.

The Monk and Deloraine open the tomb and see the body of Michael Scott "as if he had not been dead a day," clad "like a pilgrim from beyond the sea: His left hand held his Book of Might."

My suggestion gains, I think, some additional weight from a consideration of the word *clasp'd*. The line in *The Eve of St. Agnes*, which was written first, "Shut like a Missal," was changed to "Like a shut Missal," then to "Like a clasp'd Missal," and finally to its present form, "clasp'd like a Missal."¹ It seems clear that Keats had in mind the thought, not that the book was held fast in the hands, but that it was shut with a clasp. The lines from *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* show, if Keats had this poem in mind at all, that the second meaning is correct. For

Then Deloraine, in terror, took
From the cold hand the Mighty Book,
With iron clasped, and iron bound.

The "missal" passage is obscure. One cannot, of course, trace Keats' thought. I have wondered, however, whether his clause, "where swart Paynims pray," may have meant to him in the beginning anything else than an epithet to indicate a Paynim country; and whether, having introduced the word *pray*, Michael Scott's book of incantation transformed itself in Keats' mind into a book of prayer, easy enough if Keats remembered that Michael Scott was clad "like a pilgrim from beyond the sea" and held his book as one would hold a shut book of prayer.

"Clasp'd like a Missal" may therefore have had its origin in Keats' rather vivid memory of the "Mighty Book" (probably in black-letter and illuminated like a mass-book) clasped with its clasp of iron, a book of pagan wizard lore brought from a paynim country to remain clasped forever in a land where Christians pray (in Melrose Abbey). It is at least interesting that the situation in Keats' line is exactly the reverse of that in Scott.

JOHN CLARK JORDAN.

University of Arkansas.

¹ *The Complete Works of John Keats*, edited by H. Buxton Forman. Notes on *The Eve of St. Agnes*.

BOYLESVE REDIVIVUS *

The rise of Boylesve to literary preëminence was a slow and painstaking ascent, milestoned by a series of fictional masterpieces whose subject-matter and workmanship earned their somewhat retiring author a gradually increasing band of fervent admirers, though their sobriety and finish precluded his enjoying the sensational popularity of the best seller. His first full-length novel was published in 1895 and as early as 1908 his name was being mentioned among the literati for candidacy to the Academy. By 1913 there was a well-defined movement in this direction. To quote Chauvigné,

Boylesve vivait très à l'écart du mouvement, mais il serait sans doute inexact d'avancer qu'il y était indifférent. S'il ne fit rien directement pour hâter la définitive consécration, on doit pouvoir dire que sa réputation grandissante le poussait en avant, qu'il était fort répandu dans les salons littéraires, qu'il menait une vie mondaine très spéciale, qu'il détestait d'ailleurs, qu'il devait pratiquer cependant pour la pénétrer comme psychologue, mais aussi en conquérant.¹

With the advent of the War, literature was momentarily forgotten and Boylesve, together with his wife, hastened to contribute his share to the national endeavor by enlisting in hospital service, which, however, did not prevent his election, in 1918, as an "immortal" by a large majority over his rivals for the "fauteuil" of Alfred Mézières.² Fame now threw wide its portals to him, and before long, the writer whose work had been savored by only a comparatively small group of connoisseurs was being heralded as one of the leading novelists and one of the outstanding masters of French prose of his day. Other writers clamored for prefaces from his

*René Boylesve: *le Confort moderne* (Paris, Eds. des Cahiers libres, 1926, 109 pp.); *les Deux romanciers* (Paris, J. Ferenczi et fils, 1926, 190 pp.); *la Touraine* (Paris, Emile-Paul, 1926, 113 pp.); *Azurine, ou le nouveau voyage*, avec une introduction de Gérard-Gailly (Paris, les Amis d'Edouard, No. 18, 1926, 57 pp.); *Feuilles tombées*, introduction de Charles Du Bos (Paris, Eds. de la Pléiade, 1927, 165 pp.); Auguste Chauvigné, *le Jardin secret de René Boylesve*, extraits de sa correspondance (Paris, Ferenczi, 1927, 304 pp.)

¹ *Le Jardin secret de René Boylesve*, p. 160.

² These facts are gleaned from Chauvigné, *op. cit.*, chapter entitled "l'Académicien."

pen; publishers stumbled over each other in their eagerness to obtain his manuscripts. In the eight years intervening between his election to the Academy and his death, some ten volumes appeared under his name, the year 1925 witnessing the publication, in rapid succession, of no less than three of these, *Je vous ai désirée un soir*, *Nouvelles leçons d'amour dans un parc*, and *Souvenirs du jardin détruit*. In these last works Boylesve abandoned the minute study of the Touraine of his youth which had given the stamp of immortality to such masterpieces as *Mademoiselle Cloque*, *la Becquée*, and *la Jeune fille bien élevée*, in favor of that concern for psychology which had marked *Madeleine jeune femme* and, in such novels as *Elise* and *Je vous ai désirée un soir*, revealed a Proustian tendency toward the pathological; or, by way of diversion, we may suppose, in favor of that eighteenth-century vein which had made of *La Leçon d'amour dans un parc* a thing of such sheer delight, and which was resumed in *le Carrosse aux deux lézards verts* and, more especially, in *les Nouvelles leçons d'amour dans un parc*. And then, with his brain teeming with plans for further work and his desk littered with embryonic manuscripts, Boylesve, his vigor sapped by his years of assiduous mental effort, succumbed to an attack of intestinal strangulation and died, after a fruitless operation, on January 14, 1926.

The months which have passed since Boylesve's death have served, on the one hand, to solidify the fame which he had so justly earned and, on the other, to fix in the memory of his surviving admirers the winsome charm which made of an hour spent in his company a never-to-be-forgotten pleasure. Through the efforts of his literary executor, M. Gérard-Gailly, his manuscripts were put into shape and eagerly sought after by competing publishers. The conservative old firm of Calmann-Lévy, which had brought out most of Boylesve's volumes either originally or in reprint, was deemed to have abused the good nature of the gracious Academician and was replaced by such newer establishments as Ferenczi, Schiffrin, le Livre, and others, and a continuous stream of posthumous writings issued from the press. Some of these dated from the early days of Boylesve's career; such, for instance, are *Azurine* and *le Confort moderne*. The latter, written as early as 1903, but not published until shortly after its author's death, is an amusing, semi-Voltairean "conte philosophique" on the introduction of the "latest improve-

ments" into the domestic and social life of a wealthy young Parisian couple. *Azurine, ou le Nouveau voyage*, brought out by M. Champion as No. 108 of the interesting series of brochures printed privately for les Amis d'Edouard, goes back to the beginnings of Boylesve's career, having been written in 1895. The "nouveau voyage" is the "log" of an automobile trip from Paris to the lac du Bourget, undertaken by the author and two friends in the summer of 1894, this group thus serving as pioneers in that latest sport of long-distance touring. The account of the trip is prefaced by an interesting introduction from the pen of M. Gérard-Gailly, entitled "René Boylesve et l'automobile," in which he studies the novelist's interest in motor-drawn vehicles and reveals him as one of the first to have made use of them for fictional purposes. It may be noted here that, by some strange oversight, M. Gérard-Gailly, in listing those of Boylesve's works in which the automobile plays a prominent rôle, makes no mention whatsoever of his first novel, *le Médecin des dames de Néans* (written in 1894), one of the principal personages of which is the possessor of a huge primitive motor-car. Between the publication of *le Confort moderne* and of *Azurine*, Ferenczi brought out *les Deux romanciers*, a collection of short-stories receiving its title from the opening tale, which had previously appeared in 1924, along with "le Mariage de Pomme d'Api" of *les Nouvelles leçons d'amour*, in the series of holograph editions of contemporary works of fiction issued by M. Champion. The Ferenczi collection is made up of six stories, one of which is "le Confort moderne," and forms an interesting sequel to such earlier volumes of short stories as *la Marchande des petits pains pour les canards* (1913), *le Bonheur à cinq sous* (1917), and *le Dangereux jeune homme* (1921).

So much for Boylesve's posthumous fiction. We now approach the two most interesting of the works published since the death of the novelist, *la Touraine* and *Feuilles tombées*. Boylesve had promised the editors of a series of works which was to compose a *Portrait de la France*, a volume on Poitiers; five days before his death, as Jean-Louis Vaudoyer tells us in a brief preface to *la Touraine*, the novelist had spoken enthusiastically of the project. The plan having been frustrated by Boylesve's untimely demise, Vaudoyer and his associates decided to issue an "album tourangeau" of Boylesve-confections, including "morceaux recueillis

dans divers journeaux, revues ou cahiers."³ The volume contains "le Jardin de la France," a lecture delivered in November, 1921, before the Université des *Annales*; five "Nostalgiques" which had first appeared in the *Echo de Paris* in 1919; and some "Fragments" taken from Boylesve's note-books and interesting for their biographical value. Of the first two sections of *la Touraine*, "le Jardin de la France" is a highly poetic appreciation of the author's native "pays," while "les Nostalgiques" are a priceless pendant to *Mlle Cloque*, *la Becquée*, *l'Enfant à la balustrade*, and *la Jeune fille bien élevée*. In five brief sketches, full of interesting details of the author's early home life, Boylesve describes the agitation of his family over the question as to the proper schooling for a boy of his class. All this occurred "environ deux ans après la mort de ma grand'tante Félicie" (vide *la Becquée*) "et vers la fin de l'été qui suivit nos fameuses affaires de la maison Colivaut"⁴ (vide *l'Enfant à la balustrade*). These two novels stand clearly revealed as autobiographical; and the details contained in the "Nostalgiques" of the novelist's entrance into the school of the "Frères congréganistes" at Poitiers, his first day there, his private lessons in Latin with the abbé Daru, and the effect of all this upon his boyish mind are indispensable for a thorough appreciation of his intellectual and spiritual development.

The year following Boylesve's death saw the posthumous resurrection of writings from various stages in his career: 1895, 1903, 1919. The anniversary of his death was to be marked by the publication of a work of much greater importance than *Azurine* or *le Confort moderne*, than *les Deux romanciers* or *la Touraine*, a work on which Boylesve was occupied during his entire adult life and of which he himself used to say: "Ce sera mon œuvre posthume."⁵ This work was none other than a "journal intime," a diary rather loosely kept in "carnets, calepins et pages volantes,"⁶ in which the novelist recorded his activities, noted his observations, crystallized his philosophy of life, and commented on his own and his contemporaries' æsthetic endeavors. With the permission of Mme René Boylesve and the assistance of M. Gérard-Gailly, this

³ *La Touraine*, introd., p. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁵ Vide introduction to *Feuilles tombées*, p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

amorphous journal was carefully sifted and a selection of its entries made for publication in an anniversary volume which was entitled *Feuilles tombées* and which was prefaced by an admirable personal and critical appreciation of the novelist from the pen of M. Charles Du Bos (who, incidentally, insinuates that the complete journal will eventually be published). In his introduction, M. Du Bos lauds the great personal charm of Boylesve, as he received his guests in the spacious library of his home in the rue des Vignes, and analyzes the somewhat contradictory qualities of his genius: quivering "sensibilité," Vigny-esque individualism, and profound objectivity, all of them seasoned by a thoroughly Gallic flavor that made him French of the French. The *Feuilles tombées* proper is a rather heterogeneous collection of items, some dated, many others "sans date," recounting important events in the author's domestic, social, and artistic life, or setting forth, with great clarity and vigor, his conception of the requisites of the literary profession. Many of these latter passages deserve a place among the pearls of wisdom of such aphorists as Joubert and Amiel. Such are:

Le plus sûr moyen de moraliser, pour un homme de lettres, ce n'est pas de prêcher la morale ou d'imaginer arbitrairement des intrigues aboutissant au triomphe de la vertu; mais c'est de montrer que l'on a de la conscience, et particulièrement celle de son métier.⁷

Le 'connais-toi' antique est insuffisant. Le ' aimez-vous les uns les autres ' est insuffisant. C'est un 'connaissez-vous les uns les autres' que l'avenir devrait s'appliquer.⁸

Several entries are devoted to an account of the pathetic illness and death of Hugues Rebell, Boylesve's colleague of the *Ermitage* days; still others hint at the novelist's relations with the world of contemporary letters: a banquet in honor of Edmund Gosse, a "soirée" at the home of Victor Margueritte, an introduction to René Doumic by Edouard Rod. And the whole is written with that fine feeling for the music and the flavor of words which characterizes all of Boylesve's writings and made of him one of the unquestioned masters of French prose of his time.

Thus far, we have been considering works of Boylesve's own composition; we now turn to a work by Auguste Chauvigné entitled

⁷ *Feuilles tombées*, p. 54.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

le Jardin secret de René Boylesve. Chauvigné, in his capacity of "secrétaire perpétuel de la Société d'Agriculture, Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres d'Indre-et-Loire," had welcomed Boylesve, on the occasion of the presentation by the Société of the "épée académique,"⁹ with an address on "l'Esprit de la Touraine dans l'œuvre de René Boylesve," which was published in the *Annales* of the society for the year 1921. The *Jardin secret* is, as Chauvigné tells us in his "avertissement," neither a biography nor a bibliography; it is rather, a sketchy *aperçu* of the life and work of Boylesve as understood at the conclusion of a forty-three-year friendship cemented by numerous *tête-à-tête* and an extensive correspondence. The title of Chauvigné's book is to be taken in its literal denotation as well as in its figurative connotation; on the one hand, we are told of Boylesve's fondness for gardens, of his love of the park contiguous to his Passy home and his dismay when this park was destroyed to make way for the erection of a block of houses, and, finally, of his never-realized ambition to possess a garden-surrounded home in that garden of France, la Touraine. On the other hand, and this was Boylesve's real "jardin secret," we are given glimpses into his heart and mind and soul, that tripartite park where all his great works were born and all his noble ideals flourished. This Chauvigné achieves by the reproduction of a large number of notes and letters hitherto *inédites*, addressed to him by the novelist, and welded together by passages of commentary which furnish us with numerous biographical details of the utmost importance and acquaint us with his gentleness of manner and charming affability. From Boylesve's "premiers pas sur la voie sacrée" through the period of his finest achievements to his election to the Academy and his "derniers rêves," Chauvigné carries us, in a tone that is adulatory but not hyperbolic, in a style which, though not distinguished, is adequate. To the future biographer of Boylesve, this work will be invaluable for significant details on Boylesve's first literary efforts, written in 1884 and 1885 while he was still a student at the *lycée* of Tours and signed with his real name, René Tardiveau; on the

⁹ In May, 1921, in honor of his election to the Academy, this Tourangelle organization presented Boylesve with an "épée académique"; Boylesve responded with a "conférence" on "Liberté et littérature" (vide Chauvigné, pp. 176-84).

narrowly-averted lawsuit threatened by the family of the music-teacher of Tours, who had been made to serve, under a slightly disguised name, as one of the characters of *la Jeune fille bien élevée*, when that novel was appearing in serial form in the *Revue des deux mondes* (the name was completely altered when the novel was published in book form and the stupid wrath of the provincial family thus mollified); and on Boylesve's Academic candidacy, election, and reception.

AARON SCHAFFER.

The University of Texas.

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF WINNERE AND WASTOURE

One of the evidences Professor Steadman used for establishing the year 1352-3 as the date of *Winnere and Wastoure*¹ was the reference in line 317 of the poem to William Shareshull, who at that time was Chief Justice of the King's Bench. As Chief Justice, Shareshull was called upon to officiate in various cases of disturbance of the peace, such as that mentioned in the poem. Around the middle of the century many of these disturbances came, as Professor Steadman explained, from just such economic conditions as the author of *Winnere and Wastoure* discusses. Professor Steadman mentioned Knighton's reference to one such uprising in Chester in 1353 and Shareshull's connection with it. Knighton's report is as follows:

Anno gratiae MCCCLIII sederunt justiciarii apud Cestriam super le Eyre magno tempore; et in defensionem eorum ne compatriotae eos nocerent assistebant prope in patria principes Walliae, Henricus dux Lancastriae, comes Warwych, comes Stafford, pro timore patriae. Justiciarii, dominus Ricardus de Wylughby, dominus Willelmus de Sharshull. . . . Illi de patria Cestriae videntes enormitatem delictorum suorum, et se non posse pro tempore in iudicio pro fortitudine adversa contendere, finem fecerunt cum principe Walliae domino suo pro v. mille marcis et lx. solvendis infra iiij. annos proxime sequentes, et fecerunt securitatem qualem princeps petere voluerit, ea quidem conditione quod le Eyre non transiret super eos. Cumque se crederent esse quietos et liberatos in toto, justiciarii

¹ J. M. Steadman, "The Date of *Winnere and Wastoure*," *Mod. Phil.*, xix (November, 1921), 211 ff.

sederunt de novo super Traylbastons, et levaverunt pecuniam ultra mensuram, et multae terrae et tenementa seisata in manus principis, et fines multas fecerunt quasi sine numero.²

Professor Steadman explained further:

Winnere and Wastoure was written by a man who speaks of himself (ll. 8 and 32) as a western man, and it is entirely possible (though I do not assert that it is probable) that, living in the West of England, where this uprising occurred, he had heard of Sharesnull's connection with this disturbance of the peace and that he knew something of the cause of this disturbance.³

Desiring more light on this problem, I made a search of the Chester records for further information as to the uprising. I found references to this same disturbance and to Sharesnull's connection with it in the Chester Chamberlain's Accounts for 1353-4:

201l. 12s. 3d. received of fines and issues before the said William de Sharesnull and his fellows assigned to hear and determine divers felonies and trespasses on Monday next after the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the 27th year, in respect of a part of the 1209l. 8s. 8d. contained in three rolls of estreats to be delivered to the Chamberlain,⁴ and

825l. 16s. 8d. received of the community of the county of Chester, as well within liberty as without, except the city of Chester, for the terms of Christmas and the Nativity of St. John the Baptist this year, in part payment of 5000 marks for a certain fine made with the Lord the Prince of Wales by the said community for certain liberties granted to them and having respite of the eyre of the Justice for thirty years from the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the 27th year, atterminated to be paid within four years next following, this year being the first;⁵

I also found in the Chester Recognizance Rolls, records of the protest of the citizens of Chester against the presence of the justices and of the agreement made with the Prince that Chester should be free from the justice in eyre for thirty years; the record reads as follows:

² *Chronicle of Henry Knighton*, Rolls Series, London, 1889-1895, II, 75.

³ J. M. Steadman, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

⁴ Stewart-Brown, Ronald, ed., "Accounts of the Chamberlains and Other Officers of the County of Chester," 1301-1360, *The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents relating to Lancashire and Chester*, LIX, 211.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

1353. An eyre having been summoned by Edward Prince of Wales, to be held at Chester, on Monday next after the Feast of the Assumption of St. Mary, the commonalty stated that the holding of the same would be contrary to their laws, and, on payment of a fine of 5,000 marks, the holding of the eyre was respited for thirty years: [26 and 27 Edw. 3. M. 4 (2)] Record defective.*

That the justices in eyre did hold sessions at Chester in spite of this agreement we know from the records in the Chester Chamberlain's Accounts, and that the uprising was at least partly a result of the presence of the justices in Chester cannot be doubted. But that this particular uprising was the one to which the author of *Winere and Wastoure* referred I cannot prove, although the evidence that it was seems at least worthy of consideration. Although I found records of similar disturbances in 1352 in Northampton⁷ and Surrey⁸ in which Sharesnull was involved, I have been unable to find a record of any such uprising, except that at Chester, between 1349 and 1365 in any part of England which might be called West. At any rate, none of the details in the records of the Chester disturbance contradict the details in the poem. If, however, the Chester uprising is the one to which the author of *Winere and Wastoure* referred, then it is impossible that the poem was written earlier than 1353.

University of Minnesota.

JESSE MAY ANDERSON.

REVIEWS

La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle. Par GEORGES ASCOLI. Paris, Gamber, 1927. 352 pp. Travaux et Mémoires de l'Université de Lille.

The many students of relations between France and Britain will find much to interest them in this book, which describes the vary-

* "Welsh Records. Calendar of Recognizance Rolls of the Palatinate of Chester," *The Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, London, 1875, xxxvi, Appendix II, 92.

⁷ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, London, 1907, ix, 277.

⁸ *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, London, 1906, ix, 421.

ing impressions produced upon the French during more than two centuries by their northern neighbors. During the Hundred Years War the two nations had ample opportunity to study each other at close range. The Battle of Azincourt, the burning of Joan of Arc,¹ and the departure of the English troops from Paris are among the events that inspired comment. M. Ascoli finds that, while certain accounts are profoundly anti-British, others show that the French did not always regret the substitution of an English overlord for one of their own nation. To most Frenchmen of the day the English appeared physically powerful, brave, and independent, but proud, cruel, treacherous at times. They make frequent reference to our ancestors' love of drink and are somewhat shocked by their disloyalty to their rulers. When the war was over there were many events that brought out expressions of French opinion, such as negotiations over Calais, the marriages of Louis XII to a sister of Henry VIII and of James V of Scotland to two French princesses, the notorious executions of Thomas More, Anne Boleyn, and Mary Queen of Scots. M. A. devotes an appendix of over 100 pages to the publication of French poems concerned with these judicial murders. Religious persecution sent Huguenots to England, English Catholics to France, especially to Douai, Rheims, and Paris. There were also scholars, politicians, and other types of travelers who crossed the Channel for less imperative reasons. The Scotch guards of Louis XI were the forerunners of men like Adam Blackwood, who established themselves definitively in France. Opinions of the British were also based upon histories, written largely in Latin, books of travel, and romantic tales that dealt with historical persons or with localities in the British Isles.²

M. A. discusses the relationships between the two countries in detail and also their effect upon French writers. He finds that the poets who visited Great Britain, Ronsard, Grévin, and Du Bartas, were little influenced by what they saw. A certain number of English words passed into French,³ but English literature

¹ A. refers to various works devoted to Joan as late as the seventeenth century. The tragedy of 1606 he mentions (p. 217) had already been published in 1603; cf. P. Lacroix, *Catalogue Soleinne*, 1 sup., no. 150.

² A. notes (p. 127) that the story of Edward III and the Countess of Salisbury appears in France for the first time in an adaptation by Belleforest of one of Bandello's *novelle*. The elements of the story go back, however, to Froissart and Jehan le Bel; cf. my article in *M. P.*, XVIII (1920), 346. Since he includes the *Orlando furioso* (pp. 130, 131) among the works that contain scenes laid in Scotland, he might also have mentioned the *Aurelio é Isabela* of Juan de Flores, several times translated into French during the sixteenth century; cf. Reynier, *le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée*, Paris, Colin, 1908, pp. 77 ff.

³ A. cites (p. 37) Cotgrave's definition of *godon* as "a filthy glutton;

exerted no influence upon French authors before the seventeenth century. A. finds parallel dialogues in the two languages as early as 1483, but no real grammar until that of Jacques Bellot in 1580 and no real English-French dictionary earlier than the edition of Cotgrave with its English-French supplement that appeared in 1632.⁴ A. shows that the first English book translated into French was a voyage by Frobisher in 1578, followed in 1590 by an account of Virginia. British men of letters who won a hearing in France wrote in Latin. Of these only two were of considerable importance, Thomas More in his *Utopia* and Buchanan in his translations and imitations of classical plays.⁵

The book is full of information, presented in an interesting manner. It is valuable not only for the period treated, but as constituting an introduction to the centuries that followed, when English influence in France became of much greater consequence. It is to be hoped that M. A. will be able to do for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries what he has done so well for the fifteenth and sixteenth.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy, Collected and Edited by
FRANZ RICKABY. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1926.
xli+244 pp.

"Ballad making," says Professor Gummere over and over again, "is a closed account." They can no longer be made, at any rate, not by civilized peoples. Of course, ballads like those of fifteenth and sixteenth century England are gone; but ballad making itself

is that hath, etc." This seems to be a misprint. I read in the edition of 1632 "a filthie glutton, or swiller; one that hath, etc."

*He overlooks John Minsheu's *Guide into the Tongues*, London, 1617. This polyglot dictionary was called to my attention by Dr. Blondheim. As the English words are given first and French is one of the eleven languages with which the author was concerned, the work must have been as useful as the far smaller supplement to Cotgrave that appeared 15 years later.

*In a note on p. 202 A. corrects the attribution to Buchanan by Sidney Lee and others of a Latin play of which the *Ephésienne*, published in 1614, is supposed by them to have been a translation. He shows how the error arose in the same way that I did in my *French Tragi-comedy* (Baltimore, 1907, p. 173). He admits that Brinon may have written the *Ephésienne*, but doubts his translating Buchanan's *Jephthes* and *Baptistes*. I hope to show in a book shortly to appear that, while Brinon probably translated *Jephthes*, there is no evidence that he translated *Baptistes* or composed *l'Ephésienne*.

is still far from dead; nor will it die till automobile and radio have utterly destroyed all homogeneous groups and reduced mankind to a cosmopolitan uniformity. We have at least abundant evidence that ballads, essentially like those of the late Middle Ages, however different in form and theme and accent, were composed in the last century in this country. Mr. Lomax has given us the songs of the cowboy and the frontier; Mr. Odum and Miss Scarborough those of the negro; Professor Gray, and now Professor Rickaby, the songs and ballads of the shanty-boy.

Professor Rickaby has produced a notable book. He has brought together fifty-one ballads once popular in the pineries of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, in seventy-five versions. A few have been printed before, but for the most part they have been taken down by the editor from the lips of men who once sang them. The sources of the texts, their history, vivid glimpses of the singers, and much interesting information besides, are given in the notes. There is an adequate, though by no means exhaustive, glossary, and indexes of titles and of first lines. And not least of Mr. Rickaby's virtues is that, whenever possible, he has given us not only the words the lumberjacks sang, but the music as well. The little old lady of the North Countree who told Sir Walter Scott that to print the ballads is to destroy them, would have taken him to her heart for that. The introduction gives a colorful, now and then, perhaps, too highly colored, picture of the life out of which these ballads sprang—the heroic days of lumbering, before machines bred efficiency and I. W. W's. Doubtless the old shanty-boy in actual life, when he came out of the woods in the springtime and filled up on squirrel whiskey, was a rather difficult person, not at all the sentimental innocent of his songs; but he was an innocent for all that, with the wonder and spontaneity of a child, and a child's noisy irresponsibility. That was the reason he could sing, so long as he was well fed and well clothed and not too badly housed. And you could no more make a machine-tender of him than you could of a lusty school-boy. The lumber barons did just that; and the shanty-boy disappeared, and his songs all died together. Mr. Rickaby has made them live for us again.

They are poor enough stuff even at their best—sentimental ditties like "Gerry's Rocks" and the "The Banks of the Little Eau Pleine," or downright drivel like "Harry Bail" (no. 27); but they give even so a sense of life, of simple, fearless men who knew their jobs and did them till they went down in a log-jam, or lay crushed under fallen branches, or what was worse—till that day came when the labor agency decided that they wouldn't do. More than one ballad voices this deep dread of the old age and poverty which the shanty-boy foresaw and could not, would not, avert. And in the meantime he sang his exploits, his skill, his loves and hates, and his deep, rich enjoyment in it all. *Carpe diem*. There

are many worse philosophies, and not many so attractive. But there were other songs, too, popular among the men in the camps, songs of shipping on the Great Lakes (nos 45, 46, and 47), of the fighting of British soldiers in India, and of the immortal prize-fight between Heenan and Sayers on April 17, 1860 at Farnborough, in Hampshire. Professor Kittredge's note to this ballad makes one wish that he would turn his hand to the history of pugilism. Ballads like these tell us, as Mr. Rickaby points out, of the antecedents of many of the shanty-boys. A goodly number of them were Irishmen who had sailed the seven seas and fought for the Queen on the Indian frontier. But all alike, Irish, French, Canadian, and Yankee, sang them with equal gusto, as they sang the exploits of John Paul Jones off the Irish coast (no. 44) and the direful story of the sinking of the *Cumberland* in Hampton Roads (no. 39).

These songs surely afford no support to the theory of communal authorship, nor can Mr. Rickaby find such support in those that sprang more immediately out of the life of the woods. On that point he is decisive: "In regard to the origin of woods songs there is no problem: they are composed by individuals who set out definitely to compose. No other theory is logically possible, it seems to me." They are made, indeed, by men like the redoubtable Shan T. Boy (W. T. Allen), who is responsible for several of the ballads in this collection (nos. 5, 11, 12, and 20). The best of all is "Silver Jack" (no. 32), which, as Mr. Lomax suggested, is probably the work of a clever newspaper man. But it was popular among the cowboys of Texas and the woodsmen of Michigan. The inferences that may be drawn from this concerning the authorship of the ballads in Child need not be pressed.

Mr. Rickaby's scholarship is impeccable; and for all that he has executed his task with such obvious spirit and gusto, he has never departed from the rigorous editorial standards that Grundtvig and Child imposed upon collectors of ballads old and new. We have but one slight correction. In that egregious but amusing piece *Ole from Norway* (no. 36), popular in the writer's youth on the Minnesota prairies no less than in the North Woods, occur the lines:

They say I'm a Norsk from Norway
Som lever po Lutfisk og sil.

In his notes, Mr. Rickaby writes: "that is, *Som Lever paa Lodsisk og Sil*,—'who lives on pilot-fish and launce.'" Now *Lutfisk* is almost certainly not *Lodsisk* (pilot-fish) but *lutefisk* ("dried cod steeped in a lye of potash"), the staple dish, as many barbarians believe, of Norway; and *sil*, in all probability, is not *sil* at all, but a blunder for *sild*, i. e., herring. *Lutefisk og sild*,—to a Yankee poetaster that spelled *norsk*.

The introduction orientates briefly and competently in the usual matters—date, origin, fabric of the poem, its legendary and historical backgrounds, metre, spirit, and the like; and there is a short list of books likely to be of service to the general reader and the student.

But Professor Chambers' *Foreward* will have a far wider appeal, for here in a little less than thirty pages is the wisest and most searching interpretation we know of the great age that gave us the *Beowulf*—an age of sound learning and rich culture, a renaissance comparable to that of age of Elizabeth, and perhaps even more significant in the history of England and of mankind. Professor Chambers's essay seems to us one of those rare fruits of the finest scholarship—how rare they are!—in which understanding and imagination have subdued the refractory materials of learning till they come to yield up to us their secret.

MARTIN B. RUUD.

The University of Minnesota.

Goethe, von MOELLER VAN DEN BRUCK. [Die Deutschen, unsere Menschengeschichte. Sechster Band]. I. C. C. Bruns Verlag, Minden i. W. [ohne Jahr].

Der deutschen Jugend gewidmet ringt dieses Buch ehrlich mit dem Problem Goethe ohne doch eigentlich zur Gestalt durchzudringen. Eine Zwiespältigkeit im Verfasser selbst scheint mir der Hauptgrund dieses Misslingens zu sein. Fest davon überzeugt, dass jede wahre Kunst national bedingt ist, dass nur Selbstbetrug über diese nationale Gebundenheit der Kunst hinwegzutäuschen vermag (S. 7), muss er doch zugeben, dass Goethe die Grenzen des Deutschtums schon heute überrage. Es sei ein Universalismus, der zunächst in seinem Fundamente durchaus national sei, der aber auswachse zu einem nationalen Universalismus und die Schranken von Raum und Zeit mit der ganzen Macht des Genius durchbreche (S. 11). Der Anfang dieser Wirkung Goethes nun sei die Tatsache, dass andere Völker wissen, "er ist da, ebenso wie sie wissen, dass das deutsche Volk da ist . . . Ihr Ende wird hoffentlich dereinst sein, dass sie die Menschen nicht zu lauter Goethes, wohl aber zu Deutschen gemacht hat" (S. 9).

Das sind unbegreifliche Widersprüche in des Autors eigenen Worten, zumal wenn später (S. 174) die nationale Gebundenheit als völlig unüberwindlich dargestellt wird: "Hier aber an einen Ausgleich unter den Völkern zu denken, der mehr wäre als bloß ein Ausgleich des Wissens, sondern wirklich ein Ausgleich des

Gefühls, ist eiteles Hoffen. Froh wollen wir vielmehr sein, wenn die Völker immer nur das deutliche Bewusstsein ihrer Nationalkunst haben."

Wie nun, wenn aber der Nationalismus Goethes gerade daraus hervorginge, dass er über die nationale Gebundenheit hinaus die Fähigkeit besessen hätte, sich einerseits anderer Völker Güter anzueignen, andererseits durch die Allseitigkeit seines Genius zu ihnen durch seine Werke zu sprechen? Da liegt ein Problem der Weltliteratur, das noch kaum ernstlich in Angriff genommen ist und das wohl der Behandlung wert wäre.

Aber auch aus zeitlicher Gebundenheit verschliesst sich Moeller van den Bruck der unvoreingenommenen Ein- und Aussicht: "Weil wir selbst in heraufsteigender Zeit und in einem bejahten Abschnitt unserer Nationalgeschichte leben und arbeiten, die der Frühantike, Frühgotik und Frührenaissance zu (?) lieben, während zuletzt noch das französische Barock auf das römische zurückgriff und dieses wieder dem pergamenischen nahestand" (S. 8), ist es dem Verfasser unmöglich, die zeitgebundene Einstellung Goethes auf den Klassizismus und die damals bekannte Antike zu billigen, ja zu verstehen.

Trotz seines Bestrebens, in Goethe immer wieder den Werdenden, den sich immer neu Vollendenden zu erkennen, verfällt er fortwährend dem Fehler, auch jederzeit den Vollendeten zu fordern. Es geht doch grundsätzlich nicht an, von dem Goethe, den wir eben als Goethe und durch Goethe kennen, zu fordern, dass er in gewissen Phasen seines Lebens anders sei. Man kann ihn als Ganzes bejahen oder ablehnen, aber nicht von einer Stufe seines Entwicklungsganges verlangen, dass sie aus andern Voraussetzungen hervorgehen solle. Daraus eben entsteht ja sein Universalismus, dass er mit einer Polarität sondergleichen für die Nachfahren als Ganzes vereinigt, was zeitlich hintereinander liegt, was zeitlich sich widerstreitet und was in gewaltiger Synthese doch schliesslich die monumentale Gestalt Goethes, des grössten Deutschen und vielleicht des grössten Menschen überhaupt ausmacht. In einzelnen Lichtblicken kommt Moeller van den Bruck dieser Erkenntnis auch nahe (z. B. S. 15), während er an andern Stellen seines Buches fast bis zur Schulmeisterei herabsinkt.

Daran ist vielleicht die Darstellungsform des Werkes selbst schuld. Man kann eben diesen dynamischen Menschen nicht statisch fassen; noch weniger ist es möglich, ganze Stufen seiner Entwicklung unter wertenden Schlagworten erstarren zu lassen. Der junge Goethe ist nicht der 'Verirrte,' denn ein Verirren setzt einen festen und bestimmten Weg voraus, den er hätte wandeln müssen, während er es eigentlich war, der uns diesen Weg zeigte. Kann man dem unreifen Jüngling vorwerfen, dass er an Gegebenes anknüpfte und es vollendend zu Neuem weiterschritt? Wo war die "Jugend um ihn her, die statt der Mache und der ewigen Regel

wieder das freie Gesetz und die Schöpfung suchten" (S. 42) und denen er sich nicht verband?

Und auch 'der Verschwärmte' ist der frühe Weimarerer, der italienische Goethe nicht, er der gerade zu jener Zeit das Auge für die Entdeckung des Gesetzes schärfte; ja, Weimar und Italien bedeuten geradezu Gesetz für ihn, jenes das gesellschaftliche, dieses das künstlerische, das wissenschaftliche. Der Sturm und Drang suchte nicht die Natur schlechthin, sondern die Vielheit in der Natur, Goethe aber die Einheit, die den Reichtum der Erscheinungen im Typus zusammenfasste. Seiner Natur gemäss, welche die Dinge nicht in der Idee, nicht abstrakt erfassen konnte, erfuhr er dies Gesetz in der Gestalt der Antike. Da diese Verkörperung des Typusgedankens nun nicht sofort als Beiwerk von ihm abfiel, können wir in der Erkenntnis seines innersten Wesens ihm daraus einen Vorwurf machen? Niemand kann dies schöner als Goethe fassen, wenn er sagt: "Das Persönliche entwickelt sich aus einem selbständigen, unerklärlichen Keime, und die Entwicklung wird durch die äusseren Umstände bloß begünstigt. Das Ganze nähert sich dadurch der wirklichen Natur, wo der Mensch, dem es nicht an eigener Lebenskraft fehlt, nie bloß durch die ihn umgebende Welt bestimmt wird, aber auch nie alles aus sich selbst entwickelt." Nirgends überspannt der Verfasser, der diese Stelle selbst zitiert (S. 147), seine Forderungen so weit, als in der Abneigung gegen die Antike und im Verlangen nach gotischer, naturalistischer Kunst. Er übersieht aber auch das Element der letzteren, wo sich die Synthese der beiden Stile bereits vollzogen hat, z. B. im Hexameter des goethischen Epos, dem man immer noch seine deutsche Rhythmik und Melodie nicht zugestehen will, und in dem Zeitbild der *Wahlverwandschaften*.

In diesem Roman eine *Lösung* des Problems zu fordern, geht durchaus über die Grenzen der dichterischen Aufgabe hinaus; der Dichter stellt das Problem, die Lösung bleibt uns vorbehalten. Gerade daraus, dass er es nicht löst, ergibt sich die in Goethes Schaffen so seltene strenge Tragödie, deren doppelte Quelle aus den gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen seiner Umwelt und Goethes eignen ethischen Anschauungen fliesst. Wie Ibsen setzt er hier der Missdeutung eines vorhergegangenen eigenen Werkes (*Wilhelm Meister*) das Korrektiv eines neuen gegenüber.

Auch im Einzelnen leidet das Buch Moeller van den Brucks an unhistorischer Einstellung ("die Zwergenhaftigkeit des achzehnten Jahrhunderts in ästhetischen Dingen" (S. 47)—und wie wir's dann zuletzt so herrlich weit gebracht!) und an gefährlichen Verallgemeinerungen:

Goethe habe sich nie im Liede einzugestehen vermocht, was ihn an die äusserste Grenze des Unglücks geworfen (S. 28)—ich erinnere nur an die Marienbader Elegie!

Der Schmerz, den er Friederike zugefügt hätte, habe ihn zuerst ganz gleichgültig gelassen, während er nichts eiligeres zu tun gehabt habe, als das Lotteerlebnis loszuwerden—zwischen Sesenheim und *Götz* liegt weniger Zeit als zwischen Wetzlar und Werther.

"Von seinem Verhältnis zu derjenigen Frau, zu der er die tiefste Beziehung hatte, eine leidenschaftliche und geistige zugleich, handelt kein Gedicht" (S. 70)—"Warum gabst du uns die tiefen Blicke," *An den Mond*, "Den Einzigen, Lida, welchen du lieben kannst"?

Völlig falsch dagegen ist es, Goethe einen Don Juan zu nennen zu der Zeit, als er sich nach Strassburg "in neuen Abenteuern, doch ohne dass sie einen bestimmten Gegenstand gehabt hätten, umtrieb" (S. 29). Dazu fühlte er viel zu tief den Fluch des Unbehausten.

Die ganze Chronologie zwischen Wetzlar und *Werther* ist ungenau. Vom 'Fluch des Kain' spricht Goethe am 12. Juni 73, wo er noch über Einsamkeit klagt, noch bei Jähmung des Volperts-hauser Balles einen Angsttraum hat; der Humor ist durchaus noch nicht Herr geworden.—Die Warnung "Sei ein Mann, und folge mir nicht nach," vor die zweite Ausgabe des *Werther* gesetzt, gehört überhaupt erst in das Jahr 1775.

Seite 66 verfälscht der Druckfehler 'Geschmeidigkeit meines Wesen's (statt 'Geschwindigkeit') den Sinn der Stelle, die übrigens hier in ihrer ganzen grundlegenden Bedeutung für Goethes Weimarer Erfahrung garnicht erkannt ist (siehe meinen Aufsatz "Goethes Werther als nervöser Charakter," *Germanic Review*, vol. I, no. 3, p. 251 und Korffs Festrede, *Jahrb. der G. G.* 12, S. 1 ff.). Auf derselben Seite steht 'Plundersweiler' statt 'Plundersweilern.'

Immerhin, soviel im Einzelnen und im Ganzen verfehlt erscheinen mag, es wäre ungerecht, nicht anzuerkennen, wie gut und klar die Darstellung von Goethes wissenschaftlichen Verdiensten, von Goethes Verhältnis zu Kant und manche andere Teile des Buches geraten sind. Trotz seinen Fehlern bleibt es eine anregende Studie, die in spätern Auflagen, wenn der Verfasser die Zwiespältigkeit seiner eignen Einstellung zu überwinden vermag, an Bedeutung gewinnen müsste.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Guillén de Castro y Bellvis, *La Tragedia por los celos*. Edited by HYMAN ALPERN. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1926.

This dissertation presents in an able manner information concerning an important character in Spanish literature and adds a good edition of one of his plays to the small number of critical

texts available for the study of his theater. The author of the book has hunted the texts of the play in the European libraries, has considered the date and the sources of the work, and has given a critical estimate.

On p. 17 mention is made of the fact that there appeared in 1861 a Spanish edition of Castro's *Don Quijote de la Mancha* by Ventura de la Vega. A rather misleading remark follows: "This was reprinted in 1905 at Valencia by the Societat Lo Rat-Penat, with an introduction, stage directions, and notes in catalán, by Cebrián Mezquita." If Mr. Alpern means that the latter work is a reprint of Ventura de la Vega's edition, he is mistaken. Cebrián Mezquita affirms on page v of the introduction of his edition:

La present reproducció de l'obra de Guillem de Castro s'ha pres fidelment de la Primera Part de les de est'autor, edició de Valencia de 1621, —eixemplar únic conegut en Espanya, que se conserva en la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.

In speaking of the influence of Castro, on p. 22 of the introduction, Mr. Alpern holds that his *Don Quijote* formed the basis of Guérin de Bouscal's *Dom Quichot*. In a foot-note on p. 17 it is stated that Castro's *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, published at Valencia in 1618 and again in 1621, was translated into French in 1638 by Guérin de Bouscal. Mr. Alpern adds: "See E. J. Crooks: *A Critical Edition of Guérin de Bouscal's Dom Quichot de la Manche*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1925." I do not know why Mr. Alpern attributes to me the assertion that Guérin de Bouscal imitated Castro's play. It is unwise to cite a work which one has not read. Mr. Alpern has not seen my edition of Guérin de Bouscal's *Dom Quichot de la Mancha*, for although through an error, for which I was in no way responsible, this edition was announced to be in press, it has never been sent to the publishers. Instead of crediting to me a statement, which I know to be untrue, it would have been better to give as authority persons who have made the assertion and whose works are listed in the bibliography of the dissertation, such as Adolphe de Puibusque, *Histoire comparée des littératures espagnole et française* (Paris, 1843), II, 171, 172, G. Ticknor, who quotes Puibusque in his *Histoire de la littérature espagnole* (Paris, 1870), II, 342, or Cebrián Mezquita, p. v of the *Prohemi* to his edition of Castro's *Don Quijote de la Mancha* (Valencia, 1905). It is clear that not one of the three men cited has compared Castro's play with that of Guérin de Bouscal, for, though the French dramatist used the Cardenio episode of Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, there is no evidence that he was familiar with Castro's imitation of it. An important element of the Spanish play is Castro's invention of the mistaken identity of the two leading male characters. When Cardenio discovers that he is of noble birth and that his rich rival is the son

of the humble people with whom Cardenio has passed his boyhood, he makes known his love for the aristocratic Luscinda and the "marqués" marries the peasant Dorotea. Castro lays decided emphasis on the unworthy thoughts and mean deeds of the supposed nobleman. The main characters of the two plays are of the same type and bear similar relationship to each other, but that is due to their common source. The French writer uses none of Castro's changes in plot and there is no case of verbal resemblance to the Spanish play. The first attribution of the imitation by Guérin de Bouscal must have been based merely on the similarity of title, without a comparison of texts. Other critics, in repeating the statement, have not investigated the facts.

If, on the basis of title, one were establishing the influence of Castro upon French authors, there might be included the name of Pichou, who, in *Les Folies de Cardénio* (1629), dramatized the same episode from Cervantes' novel as did Castro in *Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Pichou makes no use of Castro's invention of the lowly birth of Fernant in order to explain his actions. As in Cervantes, the noble nature of Fernant asserts itself and causes him to decide rightly in regard to the two women. Pichou, like Castro, begins his work with conversation between the lovers and puts into the action of the play the main events of their love affairs, instead of giving them in *récit*, as does Cervantes. This change, which is natural in the dramatization of a novel, does not indicate, in idea or in expression, influence of the Spanish play. Another title which might suggest imitation of Guillén de Castro is *Le Curieux impertinent* (1645) by de Brosse, which is a play based on the same story from *Don Quixote* as Castro's *El curioso impertinente* (1618). De Brosse resembles Castro in the motivation of the surrender of the heroine to Lotario through adding the belief that her husband's frequent absences from home are due to his love for another woman, but de Brosse does not use Castro's addition of a former love affair between the heroine and Lotario, and of Lotario's withdrawal in favor of his friend Anselmo. The French comedy, like the Spanish play, does not have a tragic ending. The points of resemblance might easily have occurred to de Brosse independently, and do not prove that he used Castro's play as a model. This is the opinion of Georg Babinger in his dissertation, *Wanderungen und Wandelungen der Novelle von Cervantes 'El curioso impertinente' mit spezieller Untersuchung von Brosse's 'Le curieux impertinent'* (Erlangen, 1911). The *Segunda Parte* of Castro's plays, published in Valencia in 1625, contains a play, *La fuerza de la sangre*, which bears the same title as Hardy's *La Force du sang*, published in Paris in 1626. Hardy says in the *Argument* that his work is written in the same words as those of Cervantes' novel, *La fuerza de la sangre*.

A few changes have been introduced by Hardy, but these do not appear in Castro's imitation except a child's conversation, which is similar in naturalness but different in wording, and the hero's regretful memories of his base act against an innocent girl. Hardy does not mention a number of other inventions by Castro, such as the fact that the heroine's marriage to Don Diego was to take place on the night that she was dishonored by Grisante and that she finds the possibility of her marriage to Grisante complicated by his shipwreck and by her cousin's desire to marry him because she believes that she was wronged by him. The conclusion is that Cervantes was Hardy's only source. The consideration of these plays contributes nothing to the knowledge of Castro's influence in France, but they are worthy of investigation, especially if titles are to suggest imitation.

The question of Guillén de Castro's influence is, however, a subordinate part of the dissertation. The main purpose, to edit a play and discuss the facts pertaining more directly to it, has been very satisfactorily accomplished and the edition is a valuable contribution to the study of the seventeenth century Spanish theater.

ESTHER J. CROOKS.

Goucher College.

Middelnederlandse Legenden en Exempelen. Bijdrage tot de kennis van de prozalitteratuur en het volksgeloof der middeleeuwen, herziene en vermeerderde uitgave door Dr. C. G. N. DE VOORS, Groningen, Den Haag, J. B. Wolters, 1926, XII + 374 pp. f 5.90.

Ever since the importance of the mediaeval *exempla* was first pointed out by an American scholar, T. F. Crane, and this vast field of mediæval fiction surveyed, the material has grown under the hands of the investigators, and now forms quite a stately library all by itself. The present volume, first published in 1900 in the form of a dissertation, professes to give a survey of this form of literature in the Netherlands, *i. e.* Holland, Belgium and the (formerly) Flemish parts of France. Bearing in mind the peculiar position of this region, between France and Germany, traversed by the great pilgrim road from Paris to Cologne, one will not be inclined to underestimate the rôle of Middle Dutch letters in the study of the European Middle Ages, least of all for this particular form of literature with its semi-ecclesiastical character. Add to this the significant fact that during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century—precisely when the literature of the *exempla* reached its greatest bloom—the Netherlands were the wealthiest

country north of the Alps, that in the fifteenth century they had a Renaissance all of their own, with the rise of Mysticism and the first school of Flemish painters, and the book will be found to supply a genuine need.

Considering the vastness of the subject—the total number of *exempla* amounts to more than a thousand—the author has limited the scope of his enquiry by including in the main the edifying *exempla* (*stichtelike exempelen*), i. e. the genre referred to by French writers as *contes pieux*. After a survey of the chief collections, from the *Vitae patrum* to Jacobus de Voragine, he gives a good summary of the nature of the *exempla* and their rise, development and diffusion. He rightly emphasizes the prevalence of oral transmission, which frankly puts this form of narrative in the category of popular tales and would justify, in most cases, an application of the geographical method as inaugurated by the Finnish school of folklorists. In the following chapters he treats in succession the respective rôles, in the *exempla*, of our Lady, Christ, the Devil, the Jews, the Holy Sacrament, Confession, and *de Vier Utersten* (as the Middle Dutch *exempla* call them), i. e. the four last things. In three more chapters he discusses the rôle of the allegory, the influence of Mysticism and the novelistic *exempla* (*moraliserende exempelen*), i. e. stories such as are found in the *Gesta Romanorum*, the chess-book of Jacobus da Cessone, the *Dialogus Creaturarum*, etc. In a concluding chapter he surveys the visissitudes of this form of literature in Renaissance and post-Renaissance times.

The chief value of the work lies probably in the numerous quotations of Middle Dutch texts, mostly unedited and which the author has copied, with no mean amount of pains, from the MS. materials of Dutch, Belgian and North German libraries. The treatment, though very sympathetic and quite charming in form, does not adduce many new facts. There again the chief value of the book is probably its successful attempt to bring together data which have so far been scattered in learned periodicals and various histories of literature.

The numerous survivals from heathendom, still noticeable in many such tales (ordeal of the bier, extinguishing fire by magic) are somewhat cursorily treated, and one would often like to know whether we are dealing with pieces of the Old Frankish religion or with migratory legends of Mediterranean origin. On the other hand, the author frankly recognizes in the saints' cult a continuation of the hero worship of antiquity (p. 59) and the generally conciliatory policy of the Church, bent on modifying rather than destroying pagan cults, a policy which has often been denied by modern scholars, ardent admirers of the Roman Church though they were. The sexualism at the base of Mariolatry is hinted at

(p. 68). The rôle of the Devil as an object of pity, eager to be re-admitted to Heaven, is mentioned without explanation (p. 164). The strange conception is probably due to the infiltration of Eastern sects, the so-called Devil-Worshippers.¹ The Devil as a rider on a black horse, inducing a man to mount after him and leaping with him into the water (p. 171) is but the christian form of a wide-spread tale, where a nix assumes the shape of the fatal horse.² A classical example of the man ready to deny God but unwilling to deny the Virgin is found in the *chanson de geste Gormond et Isembard*.

It is somewhat to be regretted that the bibliographies are not as a rule brought up to date. I shall therefore give a few supplementary notes, without aiming at completeness. *The Young Man betrothed to Our Lady* (p. 85), cf. P. F. Baum, *P. M. L. A.*, xxxiv (1919), p. 523; G. Huet, *Revue Hist. Rel.*, 1913, p. 193. Soul in plant (p. 91), cf. Bolte-Polívka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, I, 262; *P. M. L. A.*, xxxviii (1923), p. 457; *Arch. Rom.*, vi, 376. *Dons merveilleux* (p. 96), cf. E. Cosquin, *Rev. trad. pop.* xxviii (1913), p. 347. *La légende du page de sainte Elisabeth* (p. 122), cf. Cosquin, *Etudes folkloriques* (1922), p. 73. *Crescentia* (p. 124), cf. A. Wallensköld, *Le Conte de la femme chaste convoitée par son beau-frère*, Helsingfors, 1907. The Devil as loyal servant (p. 165), cf. A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters* (1925), p. 242. Raven crying *cras* (p. 287), cf. J. Klapper, *Erzählungen des Mittelalters* (1914), p. 25; 235.

Taken as a whole, the work is a useful contribution to the history of mediaeval literature and of considerable value to the student of the *conte pieux*.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

A Study of the Middle English Poem Known as the Southern Passion. By BEATRICE DAW BROWN. Oxford, 1926. 111 pp.

This monograph, the first four chapters of which were written as a Byrn Mawr dissertation, presents an important study of the *Southern Passion*, a religious poem hitherto unprinted. Dr. Brown's work will serve as introduction to the Early English Text

¹ On this curious sect cf. A. v. Haxthausen, *Transkaukasien*, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 221 ff.; René Dussaud, *Histoire et religion des Nosairis*, Paris, 1900, *passim*; Isya Joseph, *Devil Worship*, Boston, s. d., *passim*.

² J. W. Wolf, *Niederländische Sagen*, Leipzig, 1843, pp. 62; 314; Powell-Magnússon, *Icelandic Legends*, London, 1864-66, I, 106 ff.; W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, London, 1896, I, 44.

Society edition of the poem which is at present in process of publication.

The author discusses in five chapters all the important problems in connection with her text, including MSS., provenience and dialect, sources, and authorship. Chapter I,¹ which is introductory, describes the poem in general terms. In its complete form the *Southern Passion* contains some 2250 lines dealing with the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ. It is included whole or in part in almost all the manuscripts of the *South English Legendary*, with which, for stylistic reasons as well, it may be identified.² Internal evidence dates the *terminus ad quem* of the *Passion* at 1290; the anterior limit is set by that of the *Legendary* at 1272. The contents of the poem offer a close rendering of gospel and sometimes apocryphal material, skilfully woven into a continuous, restrained narrative, conspicuous for its lack of the legendary expansion found, for example, in the *Northern Passion*. Chapter II deals with the extant MSS of the *South English Legendary* in which the *Passion* is included. The MSS are first described in detail and then discussed in their relationship to one another. The whole complicated relationship within and between the two groups into which she divides them is made clear by line for line comparisons of the texts and by a series of diagrams.

The problem of the provenience of the poem is inevitably approached through that of the *Legendary*. Dr. Brown attacks the assumption previously held that the *Legendary* was compiled at the Abbey of Gloucester. To support her attack she cites actual allusions in the *Legends* which seem to point to Somersetshire as their back-ground. Her study of the language of the MSS of the *Passion* supports still further her claim for a south-western origin of the *Legendary*. She offers an analysis of the dialect of the several MSS, wherever possible comparing the *Passion* text to documents of established provenience. The purpose of the study is "to establish the character of each text as prevailingly Southern or Midland" (p. 35), and to show "the type of modification undergone in the course of a century and a half by an originally South-western text" (p. 36).

The most important sources of the *Southern Passion* were the Vulgate and the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor. The Vulgate supplied not only the substance but for the most part the phrasing of the parts of the *Passion* devoted to the life of Jesus. The *Historia Scholastica* probably gave to the *Passion* its narrative

¹ The title of Chapter I, "*The Southern Passion* in its relation to the *South English Legendary*," is slightly misleading. As will be seen, the chapter includes all the material necessary for the understanding of the more specialized study brought forward in Chapters II to V.

² The only complete edition of the *South English Legendary* is edited by Horstmann, *E. E. T. S.*, vol. 87. However, the MS here published (Harley 2277) is one of the few which does not include the *Southern Passion*.

structure and the bulk of its expository material. Other twelfth-century authorities which may have been used are Hugo of St. Victor, Abbé Robert of Tuy, and Bernard of Clairvaux. Dr. Brown finds no influence of the liturgy but occasional reflections of ritual and of the language of the service book. An interesting conjecture is that the evidences of fear described in the poem on the part of the Maries at the Tomb are a poetic rendering of the rubric instructions for the Maries in the liturgical Easter play. The chapter on sources is closed with a detailed discussion of the resemblances—chiefly emotional in character—between the *Passion* and both the *Meditationes Vitae Christi* and the *Lignum Vitae*. The whole chapter offers an interesting study of the process—to use Dr. Brown's own words—"through which the spirit and substance of medieval theology were transferred into the popular literature of devotion" (p. 52).

Chapter V propounds an important new theory of authorship for the *South English Legendary*, which hitherto has been considered an anonymous work. After considering the general tone and purpose of the collection, Dr. Brown with some degree of certainty assigns its authorship to the Dominican Friars, rather than to the usually accepted monastic house. The important points of her proof are: (1) an audience of actual listeners is repeatedly recognized in the poem, an audience which is regarded as unlettered; (2) there is no historical evidence to show that the thirteenth-century monasteries were zealous for the spiritual needs of their parishioners; (3) the pieces in the *Legendary* are unsuited to use in the appointed services of the Church; (4) the *Legendary* constantly exhibits an attitude toward the church and social order which is historically attributed to the friars and which in many cases is reflected in works of authentic friar authorship; (5) active sympathy with the friars is again and again shown; (6) the attitude toward women and the knowledge shown of the details of ordinary life are impossible for a monk. The *Legendary* is further assigned to a Dominican rather than a Franciscan friar because of the exaltation in the poem of the figure of St. Dominic. Finally, attention is drawn to the fact that the author of the great corresponding collection, the *Legenda Aurea*, was Jacobus de Voragine, a Dominican.

Dr. Brown has conducted her investigation with thoroughness and with a sympathy for her material which makes her monograph excellent reading. She is careful to qualify her general statements (see for example pages 33, 62, and 89), and her conclusions are drawn only from adequate evidence. Moreover, even the brief quotations from the text of the *Passion*³ serve to justify her claims

³ At no point does Mrs. Brown make clear from which MS she quotes her extracts from the *Passion*. One supposes that this point will be unnoticed when the text itself is published. However, in this separate study one would be glad to have the source of the quotations indicated.

for the intrinsic value of the poem apart from its interest as a literary problem. In fine, the medievalist can look forward with pleasure to the publication of the text of the *Southern Passion*, to which Dr. Brown's study furnishes so happy an introduction.

MILLICENT CAREY.

Bryn Mawr College.

Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642. OLA ELIZABETH WINSLOW. University of Chicago dissertation. Privately printed, 1926. 186 pp.

In her dissertation Miss Winslow has presented the results of a painstaking study of low comedy elements in medieval and Elizabethan drama in an attempt to set forth the structural relation of this comic matter to the drama. Her work shows care and untiring industry, but her conclusions are neither clear, concise, nor convincing. At one moment, Miss Winslow seems to argue for steady development in the technique of low comedy; at the next, the preponderance of evidence forces her to doubt the progress of development. Miss Winslow would have been happier in a title if she had elected to call her treatise *Functions of Low Comedy in the Drama before 1642*. She has collected and presented a mass of material illustrative of the use of low comedy, but she does not draw any conclusions which are sufficiently convincing. Perhaps this is owing to the fact that the material is frequently contradictory.

To conclude that manipulation of plot situations in moralities by low comedy characters resulted in the conscious development of a low comedy technique to that end seems to be pushing a theory too far. Likewise Miss Winslow's attempt to prove that low comedy was often consciously used to serve as a time element is weak. To be sure, clownery was sometimes used for this purpose, but to formulate a definite technique is hazardous conjecture. The numerous complaints of the dramatists against the public appetite for low comedy indicate that buffoonery was necessary to popular favor; few dramatists took the pains to make their clownery essentially functional.

The statement (p. 105) that protests against low comedy presented the academic view is hardly accurate. Marlowe, Jonson, and later even Heywood, to mention only a few, protest as practical dramatists against an overburden of clownage.

To quibble with Miss Winslow over her interpretation of certain scenes would be futile, since such interpretation must neces-

sarily be subjective; yet I cannot accept many of her statements. To say that the entire comic technique of *Misogonus* (p. 88) is closely knit seems to me to misread the play. Nor can I see that Launce's scene with his dog (p. 119) in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* consciously burlesques, even slightly, the main love-plot. Likewise, I cannot believe that Autolycus had any contemporary relation to the structure of *The Winter's Tale*, aside from that of extraneous entertainment.

Miss Winslow attempts to make a point that after Shakespeare the social status of low comedy characters was raised for comic effect. She points out (p. 140) in illustration that Sir Gyles Goosecappe is funnier because he has a title, but she forgets that the earlier Falstaff was Sir John, and Lyly's Tophas was Sir Tophas, not to mention the social position of Pilate and Herod.

Miss Winslow loses the contemporary point of view in protesting against the impropriety of Greene's representing "a Queen as taking pleasure in the drunken sportings of Adam in *A Looking Glass for London and England*" (p. 100). Not only drunkenness, but insanity was comic, and Elizabethan women were not too squeamish to be amused even by mad-house antics.

The omission of all consideration of the striking low comedy matter in *Fulgens and Lucres* is a serious error in a treatise which attempts a complete discussion of the subject. Certainly such an important play at the beginning of the secular drama should not be overlooked.

Perhaps more careful proof-reading would have prevented such errors as Quiller-Couch for Quiller-Couch on p. 109. It seems not too much to ask also that a work designed as a scholarly contribution have an index.

Probably Miss Winslow attempts the impossible in her effort to arrive at a definite structural technique in so amorphous a mass as Elizabethan low comedy. She has presented some valuable and suggestive material for the further study of this portion of the early drama.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen. FRANZISKA FÜLLER. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1924. 96 pp.

It is a pleasure to review this booklet which, in limited compass, contains a profound analysis of the portrayal of women characters in Kleist's dramas and prose narratives. Perhaps only a woman

with genuinely refined insight into Kleist's conception of love as it is mirrored in women like Agnes, Alkmene, Eve, Penthesilea, Käthchen, die Marquise von O. . . and Natalie could write so searching and convincing a treatise on this difficult theme. Her investigation is free from the extravagances of interpretation that have marked various attempts at setting forth Kleist's attitude toward the women who played a part in his life and those who figure in his works. The author is well acquainted with literature on Kleist, and, without indulging in polemics against other critics, takes issue with some of them in a concise and discriminating presentation. Her book contains a judicious selection of significant quotations from Kleist's letters that reflect his views on woman, on love and the relation of man to woman. Such passages are set forth carefully as a background for an understanding of the women in Kleist's works.

The author's ability to state valid conclusions in trenchant fashion stands out in a sentence like the following: "Kleist ist keine philosophisch-spekulativ gerichtete Natur, und so sehr er sich auch bemüht, die Dinge mit dem Verstande zu erfassen, der Urgrund seines Wesens ist Gefühl, seine "seltsam gespannte, ewig unruhig bewegte Seele" konnte sich daher aus den Wirrnissen, in die sie die Philosophie gestossen hatte, nur retten durch die Versenkung in das ihr ureigenste Gebiet: die Poesie" (p. 17). An occasional summary statement requires more adequate development to make it entirely convincing or to bring out its full significance. This is true of the following conclusion: "Dass 'Erdbeben von Chile' ist die Novelle, in der Kleist so recht eigentlich seine Weltanschauung zur Darstellung bringt" (p. 27). In view of the careful proofreading it is somewhat surprising to find Jeronimus in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* referred to repeatedly as Jeronismus (p. 19-20).

The author has not merely published one of the sanest treatises that has yet appeared on this much-discussed subject but has written with refinement of thought and diction. Moreover, her investigation is marked by keen insight into Kleist's personality and character.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. By EUNICE RATHBONE GODDARD. The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. VII. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press; Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1927. Pp. 263.

This study contrasts pleasantly with the many doctoral dissertations that express a will to earn a Ph. D. degree and little else, for here is a dissertation that is both competent and useful—a really valuable contribution to Old French lexicography. The author modestly says (p. 4) that “it is in regard to accuracy of statement and completeness of documentation rather than in novelty of conclusions that the present work represents progress.” Those, however, who in struggling with the problems of mediæval costume have turned impatiently from dictionaries like Godefroy’s to archæological handbooks like Quicherat’s or Enlart’s—and back again—will find that this statement underrates the merits of the book. By correlating the literary and archæological data available in connection with the various terms discussed, by presenting the results in the form of a glossary and by citing in most instances a larger number of examples than can be found collected elsewhere, Miss Goddard has given us a volume that is original in method, conveniently arranged and, within the limits it sets itself, well-nigh exhaustive.

A summarizing Introduction describes the chief articles of dress worn on various occasions by women of different ages and stations, and indicates the principal changes introduced during the period under consideration. We also learn incidentally that France even at this early time was the arbiter of women’s fashions, that Chrétien de Troyes and Benoît de Saint More were accurate connoisseurs of the couturière’s art and that the romances in general, written primarily for women, were “the *Vogue* and *Vanity Fair* of the Middle Ages” (p. 6). The Glossary that follows lists one by one the different terms connected with the subject, citing pertinent literary allusions in full, referring to the iconographical evidence available and discussing previous definitions in the light of the large body of material—much of it new—thus assembled. Seven plates containing illustrations from the sculpture and manuscripts of the period, four systematic bibliographies and an index add materially to the book’s usefulness. It is much to be hoped that Miss Goddard, with her excellent preparation for the task, will continue her researches and publish similar glossaries for the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. It is also to be hoped, however, that she will not find it necessary to publish the succeeding volumes abroad. Anyone who has seen an English book through a foreign press will

know how to condone the typographical errors in this study, but it is none the less distressing that so admirable a work should be marred in this way.

GRACE FRANK.

Bryn Mawr College.

Victor Hugo. The Man and the Poet. By WILLIAM F. GIESE.
The Dial Press. New York, 1926.

Professor Giese is not the first to label Victor Hugo *Jocrisse à Patmos*, but I know of no other demonstration as thorough and complete of the essential truth of the jibe. His book is a severe indictment not only of V. Hugo but of many tendencies in romantic poetry and its varied progeny. As such it may well be irritating to Hugolators and to champions of red bonneted liberty in literature, but it is too charged with thought to be lightly brushed aside. Hugo's works and work are weighed in many balances and invariably real genius is found wanting. His entire output is deeply permeated with his personality and the key note of both his life and writing is vanity. He professes and perhaps believes himself to be a prophet and philanthropist, but serried analysis reveals him as a constant practitioner of art for art's sake. His master faculty, which he assiduously cultivated, is tyranny over words and these he proclaims in their turn sovereign over ideas. He possesses to a magnificent and perhaps unparalleled degree visual imagination and a power of evocation of form and color which makes of him a great descriptive poet, but he lacked the insight of a great nature poet. His imagination is dehumanized; it is that of an unbridled barbarian. He draws his inspiration not from real imagination but from irresponsible fancy. His splendid descriptions exist for their own glitter without ulterior significance and without blending of ornamental detail into harmony of the whole. He has a profound contempt for rationality, consistency and good taste. He mistakes bombastic rhetoric for sublime thought and so mingles the grotesque and the heroic as to give birth to a new chaos. Thus lack of all restraint and taste, and especially of the architectonic faculty, doom him to failure as an epic poet, as his inability to distinguish coarse vituperation from thoughtful satire ruin his polemic. Those who seek in poetry only virtuosity will find full satisfaction in his work, but whoso asks depth of feeling and thought, in a word, *criticism of life*, will repeat with Horace: *Montes pariantur, nascitur ridiculus mus.*

I have dwelt on the destructive side of Professor Giese's book for it is the predominant note. His strictures are amply illustrated

and justified by quotation on almost every page, but he has studied Hugo too thoroughly to be oblivious of occasional flashes of true genius which receive notice as they occur. His complaint is that he finds only a modicum of bread to an intolerable deal of ale. He writes brilliantly, enlivening his annihilating judgments with the rapier thrusts of wit which those who know his work expect from him.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

Reed College.

An Anthology of Seventeenth Century French Literature. By P. CHAPMAN, L. CONS, L. LEVENGOOD, W. VREELAND. Princeton University Press, 1927.

It is refreshing, among so many French text-books and anthologies published in this country, to come across one at least which, without any luxurious array of classification, footnotes, and notices, biographical and other, offers a felicitous combination of good taste and thorough scholarship. The extracts in this volume have been very carefully selected; the text given is always the best available. The proportions are harmonious and the relative importance of every writer comes out clearly. The minor names are not neglected: Scarron, Cardinal de Retz, Tallemant des Réaux, etc. The essential of Descartes is given here, the first *Provinciale* of Pascal, some of the most important letters of the century, and generally speaking such extracts as will spare the student the discouraging feeling of getting lost in long and difficult volumes, while there is enough to provide the spur that will lead to the complete works later on. Lastly the order adopted is the simplest, that is to say the best: the chronological one.

The reviewer of an anthology usually cannot refrain from telling his readers what he would have done if he had compiled it himself and bothers them with a long list of names and titles that he would like to add or to erase. The drama has been purposely omitted here, and wisely in our opinion. Yet one may ask whether fragments of Corneille's *Discours* or of Racine's prefaces, might not have proved useful. Maynard and Saint-Amant would not have been unworthy of a place, however scant, among 17th century poets—and the complete omission of those two independent and original writers, Saint-Everemond and Fontenelle, is perhaps the one we should personally most regret. But the book has 400 pages already and, on looking once more at its contents, we find nothing that we should wish to disappear. The limitation of space must cause a keen pang indeed to compilers of anthologies! The material presentation of the

volume also deserves high praise. It is to be hoped that the book will meet with the success it is entitled to, not only in university circles but with the general public, at a time when a renewal of interest in French classical literature has been lately conspicuous in England and America.

HENRI PEYRE.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Borgarthing Law of the Codex Tunsbergensis. By GEORGE T. FLOM. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, x, 4]. 1925.

This diplomatic text-edition represents a continuation of Professor Flom's valuable studies in Old Norwegian manuscripts. The *Codex Tunsbergensis* is a manuscript of this category containing various laws of the *Borgarþing* in southeastern Norway. Flom secured photographs of parts of it for the University of Illinois and the present edition is based upon these photographs. The edition reproduces in diplomatic print, page for page, leaves 14a to 91a from the whole manuscript of 186 leaves (the leaf-numbering does not agree with that in other descriptions, but is that of Flom's photographic facsimile). These leaves contain the national Norwegian law (*landslov*) of King Magnús Hákonsson (reigned 1263-80, known as *lagabætir*, "lawmender") as applying to the *Borgarþing* (adopted 1276). Though the manuscript has not hitherto been given separate publication, full account of its readings was of course furnished in the general publication of King Magnús' law of 1274-76 in *Norges gamle Love*, II (ed. Keyser and Munch), 7 ff. 1848. Flom adds in his introduction and notes various descriptive details which the printing could not reproduce. It is perhaps petty to call attention to carelessness in minor points, but in a cursory survey the following cases struck my attention: *Scandinavianist* (p. 9) is, if not impossible, certainly undesirable as an English word (avoided on p. 5 in the same environment). The word *bistave* (p. 14 and elsewhere, also printed *bi-stave*) is quite impossible and would even be unintelligible to one not familiar with its Scandinavian original. On the other hand in speaking of the division of words at the end of lines (p. 11) the division of *ski-pat* is referred to as apparently accidentally coinciding with the syllabic division. As a matter of fact it does not, the Old Norse syllabic division having been *skip-at*.

A. LE ROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

